







AV32

St. Mark's Library
THE
General Theological
Seminary



Chelsea Square · New York

Society for Promoting
Religion and Learning

NORTHERN CATHOLICS

*The Catholic Recusants of the
North Riding of Yorkshire
1558-1790*

IN THE SAME SERIES:

Love and the Person, John Cowburn, S.J.

In preparation:

The Passing of the New Zealand Education Act, John Mackey

English Clergy, Past and Present, edited by Fr Michael Richards

Northern Catholics

*The Catholic Recusants of the
North Riding of Yorkshire
1558-1790*

BY

HUGH AVELING, O.S.B.



GEOFFREY CHAPMAN

LONDON—DUBLIN—MELBOURNE 1966

Geoffrey Chapman Ltd.,
18 High Street, Wimbledon, London, S.W.19

Geoffrey Chapman (Ireland) Ltd.,
5-7 Main Street, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, Eire

Geoffrey Chapman Pty. Ltd.,
459 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia

© 1966 Hugh Aveling, O.S.B.

First Published 1966

282.4274

AV32


165190

Set in 12-on-13 point Perpetua type

Made and printed in Great Britain
by C. Tinling & Co. Ltd., Liverpool
London and Prescott

Contents

	<i>page</i>
FOREWORD	7
1 The Years of Confusion and Depression, 1558-82	11
2 The Heroic Years of Catholic Recusancy, 1583-1603	112
3 The Recusants of the Early Seventeenth Century, 1604-42	199
4 The Recusants of the Later Seventeenth Century, 1642-1702	301
5 The Eighteenth Century Recusants, 1702-90	364
APPENDIX I	406
APPENDIX II	441



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

Foreword

THIS is the third, in order of publication, of a series of four detailed studies of the history of the Catholic recusant communities of the three Ridings of Yorkshire and the City of York.⁽¹⁾ It seems that Yorkshire is more fortunate than some other counties, in that a large proportion of its local governmental, ecclesiastical and private family records have survived, and, with a few exceptions, access to them nowadays is easy—though the very size of the county means that there are no less than fifteen main repositories of archives. A small group of research workers has spent some ten years of toil on these local MS. materials; but we have had neither time nor opportunity to do more than prospect the only slightly less large field of sources on Yorkshire recusancy existing outside the county—particularly in the Public Record Office and the British Museum. Even in our well-beaten field of local sources, the more work we have done, the more new avenues of research were opened up, and the more numerous and baffling became the problems of interpretation of the documentary evidence. Hence this series of studies cannot possibly be anything more than a ‘progress report’.⁽²⁾

We are very conscious that the division of our report into four regional studies is not ideal. For one thing, it creates acute difficulties of composition. Those who may have the patience and pertinacity to use all four studies will find much repetition of general detail tedious; yet if we avoided that entirely the reader who is only interested in one area would be left in the dark about much background matter of importance. Again, our division by Ridings—and, indeed, any intensive regional historical studies—are liable to give a strong impression that the counties and wider districts of sixteenth and seventeenth century England were worlds apart—which is to beg a question. On the other hand,

a number of very practical considerations almost dictated the division by Ridings: the fact that the Ridings were as big as other counties and had, in most matters, their own separate civil administrations: the great wealth of detail we are able, and wish, to present: the provisional nature of these 'reports', and the present publishing situation. Moreover, the more one becomes familiar with the documents of recusant history—even, or especially, those of the central government surveying the country-wide recusant problem from Westminster—the more sharply one sees that a multiplicity of local and domestic details (family relationships, the lay of the land and of local jurisdictions and franchises, the *minutiae* of local administrative methods and of the land law and economic conditions) alone explain the behaviour of recusants and of the authorities towards them. Lastly, the core of Catholic Yorkshire recusancy through most of penal times, the landed gentry, *did*, to a very appreciable degree, think firstly in terms of their own 'country'—which meant Yorkshire, and, for many, more precisely their own Riding.

As we hope to show, the North Riding Catholic community of 1558–1600 was notably slower than that of the West Riding to work out a *modus vivendi* in the face of mounting persecution. But in the seventeenth century it shot ahead of the rest of Yorkshire in numbers and development, and (if we leave out of count the odd mushroom Catholic community of 600 which grew up suddenly in Sheffield under the Duke of Norfolk's patronage) it maintained its lead until the end of the eighteenth century. Yet this vigorous recusant community was—in all except the Faith and the bare practices of religion—so very far removed from modern North Riding Catholicism. It remained constantly very small in numbers—never more than 2,700, or less, and often much less, than two per cent of the Riding's population. It was dwarfed by successive Protestant dissenting movements alongside it—the Quakers and Presbyterians of the seventeenth century, the Methodists of the eighteenth. It was very rustic and agrarian, and never really at ease in town life. Its main centres were remote on moors or in dales, where today its chapels are derelict and forgotten or Catholics very few. Except for an important minority

of Catholic small freeholders and tradesmen—who were eventually to play a great part in enabling Catholicism to adapt itself to the new world of the nineteenth century—the great majority of Catholics were dependents of Catholic nobility and country squires who long remained remarkably numerous in the Riding. Strangers from outside the Riding were relatively few—an occasional tenant-farmer, apprentice or servant from another Riding, Durham or Lancashire, a few exotics like French chefs and entertainers at Scarborough or Italian stuccoists at Gilling and Kirkleatham; an Irishman, even as a servant or harvest-worker, was a *rara avis* indeed. The lapsed and careless were well in evidence, but the main body of practising Catholics showed much spirit, fortitude and endurance. In many things they had to rely on family resources, especially since many only had opportunities of offering Mass once every three or four weeks, and those in outlying farms only three or four times a year, and outside instruction was in very short supply. The Catechism, the Jesus Psalter and the rosary were the day-to-day staples of their religious life. Only the wealthy and best-educated had opportunities by travel abroad to make an experienced reality of the catechism truth that the North Riding community was only a minute segment of the whole Catholic Church . . . witness the overpowering effect of the entry of William Ullathorne of Scarborough into a crowded Catholic church at the port of Memel. Considering all this, while we sympathise with those many modern Catholics who feel that the acute differences between the Catholic life of that age and of our own makes it seem very remote, we cannot agree that we owe the North Riding recusant Catholics no tribute of *pietas*, or that they have nothing of value to teach us.

Notes

(1) H. Aveling, *Post-Reformation Catholicism in East Yorkshire, 1558–1790*, York, 1960; *The Catholic Recusants of the West Riding, 1558–1790*, Leeds, 1963.

(2) The following abbreviations will be used in the notes: *APC*—*Acts of the Privy Council*, ed. Dasent; *ARP*—Archdeaconry of Richmond MSS, Leeds Central Library; *BI*—Borthwick Institute, York, York Diocesan Archives; *BM*—British Museum; *CCC*—Cal. of the Committee of Compounding, Record Series; *CM*—R. Challoner, *Lives of the Missionary Priests*, ed. Pollen; *CRS*—Catholic Record Society, Record Series; *CSPD*—Cal. of State Papers, Domestic; *CSPF*—Cal. of State Papers, Foreign; *DD*—*Douai Diaries*, ed. Knox; *DNB*—*Dictionary of National Biography*; *Foley*—Records of the Eng. Prov. S.J.; *H.C.*—York High Commission Act Books (in Borthwick Institute); *Hogarth*—Hogarth MSS, Leeds Diocesan Archives; *HMC*—Hist. MSS Commission Reports; *LCA*—Leeds Central Library, Archives Dept.; *MT*—J. Morris, *Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers*; *NRRO*—N. Riding Cty Record Office; *PRO*—Public Records Office, Chancery Lane; *RH*—*Rescuer History*, quarterly; *SS*—Surtees Soc.; *STA*—Scarborough Town Archives, Town Hall; *VCHNR*—Vict. Cty History, N. Riding; *YAJ*—Yorks. Archaeological Journal; *YAL*—Yorks. Archaeol. Soc. Library, Leeds; *YASRS*—Yorks. Archaeol. Soc. Record Series; *YCA*—York City Archives, City Library.

I

The Years of Confusion and Depression, 1558-82

WE HAVE already described at length and in detail elsewhere the slow but remarkable development of the official machinery of action against religious dissidents, which was the first main feature of this period.⁽¹⁾ Queen Mary died in November 1558, but the Elizabethan Settlement Acts were not passed until April-May 1559, the Catholic Archbishop of York, Nicholas Heath, not deprived until July and not replaced by a Protestant Archbishop, Thomas Young, until 21 January 1561. Meanwhile, a very short-lived special Royal Commission of August-September 1559 had passed rapidly through the county (sitting at Malton and Richmond in the Riding) to swear in incumbents to the new religious order, fill vacant parishes and take some scattered presentments of moral and religious offences. For the rest, until September 1561, when Young got down to work on his diocese, it seems that the York ecclesiastical administration was running in very low gear—no doubt because of the uncertainty of the times and the fact that some offices were unfilled and some officials suspended and awaiting deprivation. Meanwhile the Privy Council had to rely mainly on civil bodies unchanged in personnel since Queen Mary's days—the Council of the North and the Justices. The advent of Young coincided with a very minor purge of these bodies and the founding of the York High Commission—a part-civil, part-ecclesiastical court specialising in religious repression. Nevertheless from 1561 until Young's death in 1568, we get an impression that there was an uneasy equilibrium in Yorkshire. The government judged it wisest to be

content with a general outward conformity in religion, without enquiring further about men's views, and without pressing universally subscription to a totally uncompromising Protestant formula as a condition of holding office. In return they were getting *de facto* support and external gestures of conformity from all but a very small minority indeed of the official class. It is hard to see what other policy they could then have pursued; a Protestant party hardly existed as material for an alternative government; a waiting policy of this kind, when so many were genuinely confused in their views on religion, seemed likely to achieve the government's purposes best. Although Young himself was President of the North after 1564, and a further small purge was then effected, many positions of trust necessarily remained in the hands of men whose religious views were more or less suspect or doubtful. In the North Riding, known conservatives like the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland were great landowners. Northumberland was steward of Richmond, Middleham and Ripon. He was in collusion with the Lennoxes of Settrington and their clients, who included the Cholmleys, castellans of Scarborough, the Dolmans, Constables of Everingham, and an amorphous group of North Riding gentry accounted 'mislikers of religion' though conformists. In 1564 the North Riding Bench had eighteen Justices, of whom at least eleven were suspect in religion. The Clerk of the Peace was a member of the Norton family. The Archbishop could only then think of nine other gentry in the Riding of whose religion he felt safe, and who were qualified otherwise to be Justices—and of these three or four were, in fact, suspect. The two men on whom Young depended most, Sir Thomas Gargrave, the Vice-President, and John Rokeby, the Vicar-General, had both been pillars of Marian administration at York.

After the Archbishop's death in 1568 there was difficulty in finding anyone adequate to replace him. The Earl of Sussex, who succeeded him as President, was much related to suspect Yorkshire gentry and never showed any disposition to challenge the government's hesitant policy. The Archbishopric remained vacant until 1571. It is therefore not surprising that the revolt of

the Earls in 1569 was not forestalled by vigorous action either from London or York. Acute though the crisis was, it seems to have cleared the air. Its aftermath brought—like the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536—an administrative revolution in the north. A thorough purge of offices ensued; in 1571, Edmund Grindal, a vigorous Puritan, became Archbishop of York, and in 1572 he was joined, as President, by another able Puritan, the Earl of Huntingdon. From 1572 to 1582 an increasingly powerful and united assault on Catholicism was mounted from York. Behind it lay a new definiteness in Privy Council policy. 1571 saw the first real penal law against Catholics, and 1581 the start of a system of heavy recusancy fines. However the Yorkshire machine of repression was especially effective—due to the presence in York of the Council of the North and a permanent High Commission, and to the zeal of Huntingdon and Archbishops Grindal and Sandys.

It is necessary here to sketch the main features of this repressive machinery, since it remained in place until 1641 and formed a large part of the background of Catholics' lives. But it is a formidable task, since almost every organ and official of the complicated Tudor local government were pressed into the service. In shape it resembled a very broad-based pyramid. The base was composed of a quite numerous mass of underlings and private citizens—sheriff's deputies, gaolers, parish and head constables, churchwardens, the sworn men of the many juries of presentment, sureties to recusants' bonds, searchers at the ports. The monster had feet of clay, since these agents had little or no training or *esprit de corps* in government service, were almost invariably paid only in expenses or commissions in arrears, and were naturally very susceptible to pressure from their social superiors. Yet the whole machine, administered on medieval lines, depended heavily for its information and physical force on their co-operation. The apex of the pyramid was the Privy Council, which initiated policy and tried to supervise its execution through a stream of paper and various outside irons in the local fire. The paper included orders, admonitions, warrants to call dangerous recusants before the Council board, questionnaires

designed to produce statistical information about recusancy. Naturally, also, the Council picked sheriffs, modelled the Council of the North and the High Commission's personnel and powers, appointed and dismissed Justices and clerks of the peace. In all this its choice was surprisingly limited by local realities. Its irons in the fire were various and almost always annoying to conscientious Presidents like Huntingdon. The Assize Judges on circuit delivered official admonitions, reported on recusancy and officials, and at least tried to conduct—through the inevitable and normal local channels of jury presentment—an independent enquiry into local recusancy.⁽²⁾ The Barons of the Exchequer (not the President) supervised recusant fining, though they were dependent on the Justices for estreats of convicted recusants, on local gentry juries for assessment of incomes, and on the sheriff and his deputies for collection. The Privy Council also had its information system of local friends of councillors (sometimes surprising ones). Normally its own members who were peers and local landowners also weighed in. But the presence of the Council of the North seemed to discourage this, and the North Riding's peers—Lords Northumberland, Westmorland, Scrope and Eure—were in fact employed on the Marches.

Below the apex of the pyramid came the President, his Council and the Archbishop. In typical fashion, their administration was set in the form of legal processes and their powers came from a bewildering accumulation of jurisdictions, civil and ecclesiastical. Although the Council of the North and High Commission were 'prerogative courts', the professional lawyers who formed their small permanent staffs seemed incapable of conceiving their powers and procedure except in terms of time-honoured forms.⁽³⁾ In any case, like all administrators then in England (for instance the bailiffs of Scarborough) they and their masters, like Pooh-Bah, had so many different jurisdictions and capacities, that all seemed to sink in procedure to a common denominator. Thus the Archbishop, through his ordinary, exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the diocese. By this means he could and did proceed against Catholic recusants in his visitation courts every four years or so, striking them with excommunications, expenses, troublesome

summonses—and, occasionally, when his ordinary forgot what court he was in, by bonds to go to church. In his Chancery Court his ordinary normally dealt with cases of benefices, licences and marriages. All of these obviously could involve recusancy and very occasionally the ordinary forgot and dealt with straight cases of recusancy. We may suspect that the same was true of the Archbishop's Consistory Court, which ostensibly dealt with marriages, tithe and probate. Sheltering under the wing of the Archbishop's ordinary jurisdiction was a complicated set of lower courts—of Archdeacons, of the peculiars of the Dean and prebendaries—which reflected in miniature archiepiscopal methods with recusants. But the Archbishop and most of his staff were High Commissioners. In the High Commission court the same ecclesiastical staff of lawyers, reinforced occasionally for solemnity with the President and some lay Councillors, conducted, in effect, a permanently sitting double of the Archbishop's Visitation Court. The standing material here for action was presentments made to the ordinary ecclesiastical courts (with the addition of some cases introduced through informers); the procedure closely followed that of the ordinary ecclesiastical courts. Very occasionally, the Commissioners themselves used visitation procedure—notably in 1580—swearing-in special juries for each deanery. The High Commission inflicted far more severe punishments than the lesser courts—bonds, large fines, imprisonments *sine die*. As we shall see later, the High Commission's weight and effectiveness varied from decade to decade; at its slackest it could transact little business; under a vigorous Archbishop and President it inserted a stiff backbone into the otherwise rather ineffective system of ordinary ecclesiastical courts, and itself took administrative initiative strikingly.⁽⁴⁾

The Archdeaconry of Richmond—the whole of Richmondshire—presented a problem. It lay in the diocese of Chester, although it was remote from Chester and geographically a salient into Yorkshire. From the government's point of view, there was grave danger that it would be neglected, as, indeed, it certainly seems to have been until 1571. The first Elizabethan Protestant Bishop of Chester, Downham, was not appointed until early in

1561. Although the Chester diocesan High Commission court was founded in July 1562, the bishop seems to have used neither that nor his ordinary visitational powers effectively. A series of stiff admonitions from London and complaints from Young of York produced little effect. In 1571 Grindal stepped in as Metropolitan and a stream of cases unearthed by his special visitation of the archdeaconry of Richmond was dealt with in the York High Commission. In spite of the paucity of Chester High Commission records, it seems clear that thenceforward—particularly from 1579 when the Puritan Chaderton succeeded to the Bishopric of Chester—the Archdeaconry felt the weight simultaneously, to a large degree, of repressive action emanating from both Chester and York. The Bishop of Chester carried out visitations there as ordinary, which seem to have been supplemented occasionally by metropolitical visitations by the archbishop. We have no reason to believe that the Chester High Commission neglected the Archdeaconry entirely, but the York High Commission certainly exercised an active jurisdiction over it continually, doubtless having some agreed policy with Chester. It is therefore not surprising that, in 1564, in Downham's time, the York High Commission summoned his Commissary for the Archdeaconry, Robert Hebblethwaite, reprimanded him and admonished him 'to avoid the danger of the laws hereafter', or that, in 1570, the year after the panic of 1569 and before the metropolitical visitation of Richmond of 1571, the York Commission reacted sharply to a very alarmist information about popery rife there and intervened. Even as late as 1582 a York list of Catholic suspects includes 'Hebblethwaite Commiss. of Richmond'.⁽⁵⁾

Because of the destruction of the records of the Council of the North, we are ill-informed about the exact scope of its actions against recusants. It is clear that—at least in the days of vigorous anti-papist Presidents—the Council itself took the initiative, received informations, raided suspect places, arrested priests and dangerous papists, examined and committed them to gaol, before sending them to the Assizes or to the High Commission. Apart from this, active Presidents tried to reinvigorate the High Commission, the sheriffs, town councils and Justices.⁽⁶⁾

The Justices of the Peace were not empowered by the Statutes of 1559 to take cognisance of recusancy. Unfortunately the only Yorkshire Quarter Sessions records to exist in any quantity for Queen Elizabeth's reign are those of the city of York. There, from the 1570's, the Justices were securing presentments of recusants but apparently making no process against them. The first recusant fining Act of 1581 required Justices of the Peace (as well as Assize Judges and Gaol Delivery Justices) to secure regular presentments of recusants, convict them if they refused to conform, and send records (estreats) of the convictions to the Exchequer. The Justices were also to impose on obstinate recusants bonds to be of good behaviour. Thus by 1582 the Bench had been drawn far into the repressive machine; it (increasingly supplemented by the action of informers denouncing recusants unmentioned in presentments) became the essential agent of the fining system, it was required to assist the pursuivants of the Council of the North and High Commission and to take the initiative in arresting priests and dangerous recusants, examining them in a preliminary fashion and committing them to the President.⁽⁷⁾

Two towns in the North Riding enjoyed self-government—Richmond and Scarborough. They too were drawn into the machine. Free of the North Riding Justices, they had their own Quarter Sessions which had the same duties. In addition each had a Common Council—in Richmond of the Alderman and Head Burgesses, in Scarborough of the Bailiffs and the three sets of 'Twelve Men'. Relations between the parish churches, their incumbents and churchwardens and the Common Council were close and the latter tended naturally to exercise a supervision over the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants. For neither town do Common Council minutes for the sixteenth century survive, but in 1606 Richmond Common Council had its own rule for those who failed to go to church on Sundays and holydays, doubling the statutory shilling fine of 1559. In the 1630's Scarborough Common Council in effect excommunicated those who did not pay their Easter dues to the parson, fined parents who brought noisy children to church and allowed no child to be educated anywhere

else than in the town grammar school. The sixteenth-century Council minutes of towns like York and Lincoln show that very similar religious disciplinary regulations were then also normal. We can begin to understand how, in the almost suffocatingly close domestic atmosphere of these rustic towns, the practice of Catholicism would be desperately hard, once majority public opinion was firmly Protestant. In both the North Riding towns there are signs, as we shall see later, that public opinion was hesitant and confused over religion until about 1580. There were, of course, other places in the Riding which were towns in size but which had no royal charters establishing a form of self-government. Five (Thirsk, Pickering, Whitby, Northallerton and Malton) were ancient mesne boroughs with a faint surviving borough organisation (bailiffs and a court of pleas) which usually had collapsed by the early eighteenth century. Malton and Whitby tried in vain to get charters of incorporation from Charles I. They had no Justices of their own, but not infrequently nearby Riding Justices agreed to hold petty sessions in these towns. It is hard to generalise on the obstacles or advantages their situation offered to resident recusants, since much would depend on the attitude of the major landlords and the degree of *de facto* disciplinary organisation in the town. There were nine other market towns, but they had no more than parochial and manorial government and differed little in character or size from large villages.⁽⁸⁾

Last amongst the communities with their own forms of government was the parish. As we have seen churchwardens were the maids-of-all-work of the whole machine of repression. They were required to make written returns of recusants, non-communicants and those who habitually missed part of the church service or misbehaved themselves in church—which included, at least from the time of Archbishop Grindal's injunctions of 1571, making the sign of the cross, genuflecting, using a rosary or Catholic prayer book, setting lighted candles round corpses, metwands or towels in the form of a cross on corpses or coffins, making stations with the coffin at the sites of standing crosses or shrines, praying at shrines or on their sites. These returns had to

be made every four years or so to the Archbishop's official, about every two years to the Archdeacon, annually to the Justices and also to the Assize Judges, occasionally to the High Commissioners. They were also bound by a Statute of 1559 to levy a shilling fine per person for every absence from church without good reason on the seventy to seventy-seven days a year which were of obligation, and to levy money for Easter dues, and the parish clerk's wages. They were responsible for the complete removal of all Catholic fittings and ornaments in the church, the supply of Protestant ones required by the Injunctions of 1559, and the keeping in repair of the nave of the church—the chancel was the responsibility of the rector or the lay farmer of the rectory. (Since chancels were often small, and not used liturgically by Elizabethan Anglicans, this was a less serious division of responsibility than it appears; but very frequently chancels were allowed to fall into great neglect to the point of collapse.) These financial commitments were met by the levy of an extra annual 'cessment' on all households of parishioners. If we consider these details, and remember also that clandestine Catholic baptisms, marriages and burials deprived the incumbent—and sometimes the parish funds—of income, and that by the sixteenth century all households settled in the parish had allotted pews, we can see how many means parson and churchwardens had of checking on the religious practice of every parishioner, and how many additional reasons for disliking non-attendance at church. In general it seems to be true that recusancy was very difficult indeed in a 'united' parish—by which we mean one where parish and manor coincided, one strongly Protestant landowner owned the whole parish, and the parish was small enough to need no chapels-of-ease. In fact, of the 182 parishes in the Riding listed by the *Victoria County History*, only some fifty were, in any real sense 'united' in this way. Thus it was very frequent indeed in the Riding that a parish was divided amongst numbers of manors and landlords, and so large that it required from one to as many as four chapels-of-ease, or manorial chapels. The dissolution of the chantries struck a great blow at the endowments of these many chapels and a good many had passed into private hands by 1570 and were in ruins or destroyed. Those

which survived often had a tenuous existence during the next two centuries. Their status was doubtful; they normally had no churchwardens. If we add to this the fact that such large parishes were often long in the hands of pluralist non-resident incumbents, we can see how recusancy could endure or even flourish in such circumstances. The strength of both Catholic and Protestant dissent in the vast remote North Riding parishes must, in a large measure, be due to this combination of circumstances.⁽⁹⁾

In general therefore the repressive machinery built up, largely by Huntingdon, after 1572, had both strong features and weak ones. Its strength lay mostly in the multiple ways in which it brought pressure to bear on recusants through very vigorous existing local organisations; its weakness lay in its very complexity—there were far too many small human links in the chain. But we shall see much more of these strengths and weaknesses in detail, as we go on.

The second general feature of this period was the very far-reaching change in the forms and expressions of religious life of society from residually Catholic to Protestant. Central to this was the official war on 'monuments of superstition and idolatry'. Churchwardens' accounts for the period only survive for Sheriff Hutton, Masham, and (in part) Easingwold.⁽¹⁰⁾ There seems to be no doubt about the thoroughness and reality of the clearance of roods, images, stone altars, pyxes, candlesticks, censers, vestments, Latin service books and Church plate by 1553. There is no reason to doubt also that between that year and 1558 the great majority of churches and surviving chapels were fitted out with the bare minimum needed for Catholic liturgy. The second stripping seems to have been well under way by August 1559. Owing to the uncertainty of the times and rustic prudence, it seems likely that churchwardens and incumbents often did not sell or destroy the Catholic fittings they removed, but either stored them in chests in the church or in the houses of parishioners. There are thirty-four cases in the court books concerning 'monuments of superstition' in North Riding parishes—1559, Osmotherly (images spirited away no one knows whither); 1562, Stapleton chapel in Croft; Thirsk; South

Kilvington; Coxwold; Kirkleavington; 1564, Middleham, Bolton on Swale (still has no Protestant service books), Barton, Cleasby (the stone altars still in place), Croft, Ainderby Steeple (no books), Hovingham, Husthwaite. In 1566 came the extensively documented case of Aysgarth. Rather curiously—considering that Richmondshire lay within the jurisdiction of the York High Commission—the Commissary of Richmond, in virtue of a special commission to search for superstitious ‘monuments’ surviving in the diocese of Chester given to the Bishop of Chester by the London High Commission, stumbled on the Aysgarth rood images, a pyx, chrismatory, oil-stocks, a corporax and a Latin Hymnal concealed inside the parish church. The churchwardens blandly certified, after his discovery, that they had now destroyed these things—whereas they were still concealed in Aysgarth in 1567. Now they were destroyed and the churchwardens put to a humiliating public penance. In 1567 vestments were found concealed at Danby in Cleveland. In 1569—the year of the Rising—‘monuments’ were found at Guisborough and Manfield, and the incumbents of Bedale, Hipswell and Kirkby Fletham were able to find the wherewithal to say Mass in their churches. In 1571 ‘monuments’ were found at Whorlton, Appleton in Cleveland, Grinton, Askrigg chapel and Masham and suspected to exist at Marske in Gilling West. Masham had been found in 1570 to lack some of the essential Protestant service books, but now the parish clerk was revealed as a shelterer of papist priests, and images and irons for making Hosts scattered round the parish. The public destruction of these led to a scene in Masham and an armed assault on the officials. In 1572 St Michael’s chapel, Malton, lacked service books, and ‘monuments’ were discovered at Middleton on Leaven and Tunstall in Richmondshire. There were still Catholic fittings of the church hidden in Osmotherley in 1575. After this it is not always easy to distinguish old fittings from new ones slipped in from abroad since 1559. Perhaps the very last cases of concealed old fittings were at Crambe in 1582, at Thirsk in 1586 (Thomas Bell accused of having popish vestments) and at Helmsley in 1590 (William Knott, a churchwarden, and two other men, having an undefaced

crucifix, a pax, censers, 'and other popish ornaments').⁽¹¹⁾

The exact intentions of the people who were thus found to have concealed these things were not by any means necessarily always simply religious conservatism. The *Churchwardens' Account Book* of Masham indicates that. They bought a 'Communion Book' promptly in 1559 and clearly destroyed their stone altar then. As we have seen, they were in trouble in 1567 over 'monuments', which, according to their story, even after the second concealment were left lying about carelessly or put to base uses. In 1569 the clergy and churchwardens there supported the Earls' Rising and the Protestant church books were torn up or destroyed. In 1570 they took down 'the Tabernacles' in the church—which the authorities must have seen often in past years without condemning them. It was only in 1572 that they bought a new 'Communion Book', exchanged their chalice for a Communion cup and had made a Communion table. (Presumably, like Richmond church until 1570, they had hitherto made do with the parish chest as a rough table.) Perfectly openly, in 1595 they record in much detail how 'the worshipfull and the xxiiij of the same parish' sold five sets of Mass vestments, two copes, several tunicles and dalmatics, six corporaxes, three burses, two sanctus bells and various frontals to Mr Robert Wyvill, a parishioner of a family with definite recusant leanings. It was recorded equally carefully and openly that all this 'church gear' had been stored by nine prominent men parishioners, most of whom belonged to suspect families. The mentality which lay behind this cannot be easily defined.⁽¹²⁾

The practical result of this campaign of destruction—no doubt completed by eighteenth-century removal of rood screens and nineteenth-century 'restorations'—was that today, apart from the bare fabric of medieval churches, very few traces of Catholic fittings of the early sixteenth century are to be found in North Riding churches. Medieval church bells survived best—no doubt because they were expensive to recast and their inscriptions, asking the prayers of the saints, hidden from public view in belfries. There are a very few original altar stones—like that at Crayke, long used after the Reformation as a paving-stone. There

is the screen at Wensley church, which, like the pricket iron hearse over the Marmion tomb at West Tanfield, no doubt was preserved because it was a memorial to the ancestors of the lords of the manor. Two pre-Reformation chalices survive in the Riding—at Hinderwell and Goathland.⁽¹³⁾

The campaign against Catholic primers, rosaries, crucifixes, devotional gestures and turns of speech was equally successful. In 1571 men were still collecting for the poor with St Anthony's bell at Richmond. In 1575 a Guisborough man was found using a Latin primer in the parish church. At New Malton and Ganthorpe in 1580 there was a libel against the marriage of the clergy being passed from hand to hand. In 1581 a man in Cleveland was using a rosary in church, and in 1583 a regular Commission was touring the Riding to unearth Catholic things. They found a gold crucifix in the house of Richard Cholmley gent., defaced it and returned the broken fragments to him. In 1586 a Seamer woman (apparently no recusant) was saying that curates' children were 'priests' calves' and that 'it was never a good world since ministers must have wives'. There was All Souls bell-ringing at Gilling, Richmondshire in 1578 and at Bulmer in 1587. A man was caught saying his rosary during service in Topcliffe church in 1595, and in 1596 a Buttercrambe woman attacked the marriage of ministers. Here and there we may reasonably suspect that these phenomena were not so much survivals of the past as the opinions of recusants or (especially in attacks on clerical marriage) personal malice. This may be true, for instance, of attacks on clerical marriage at Gilling (Ryedale) and Middleton in Cleveland in 1607. In 1614 recusants were going on pilgrimage to the Lady Chapel above Mount Grace, but there is modern evidence that Protestants frequented it also; the same year it was noticed that praying at the stumps of destroyed old standing crosses was common amongst the country people at Dishforth and Thornton-le-Beans. In fact pre-Reformation customs with a Catholic tinge remained tenaciously in the Riding down to the nineteenth century. In his *History of Whitby*, written in 1817, Young (who, unlike later nineteenth-century topographical writers, had no ideological reason whatever to romanticise the medieval past) noted

disapprovingly the strong survival there of 'vessel cups' (Christmas cribs carried round houses), the keeping of Childermass Day, the putting up of palm crosses on Palm Sunday, rejoicings on All Hallows night and the eating of 'soul mass loaves' on All Souls day. Rush-bearing, and the plays, piping and dancing which went with it hovers in the background of presentments throughout the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and, as we shall see later, Cleveland (and particularly Egton Bridge) remained to the nineteenth century the home of 'interludes', Christmas plays and folk-dancing.⁽¹⁴⁾

The third main feature of the period 1558-82 was the fact that the older generation of parish clergy in the great majority, albeit with an appreciable amount of hesitation and sitting light conservatively, conformed to the new religious order of things. Had they not done so, it is hard to see how it could ever have established itself. In 1558 there were some 160 parishes or quasi-parishes in the Riding and also an unknown, but perhaps not large, fraction of the forty-odd chapels which had existed in Edward VI's reign. We have absolutely no means at present of estimating at all accurately the number of clergy in the Riding then. At the visitation of 1559 eight parishes were vacant and thirty-four incumbents disobeyed the summons to court to subscribe to a short general 'acknowledgment' of the rightness of the new religious order of things. So far as we know, only two ordinary incumbents refused subscription outright and were deprived of their benefices. One of these was Roger Thompson, vicar of Ampleforth. It is very likely that he had been a Carthusian novice at Mount Grace at the dissolution of the house, was put on bond in 1562, as 'late a superstitious monk of Mountgrace, unlearned', to keep out of the dioceses of York and Durham, and was back in Carthusian life as prior of the exiled Sheen Anglorum at Louvain from 1581 until his death in October 1582.⁽¹⁵⁾ The other was Richard Salvin, rector of Hinderwell and a member of the family of Salvin of Croxdale, Co. Durham. He was hiding from the High Commission somewhere in Cleveland in 1570 and died there in 1571. Also deprived after the 1559 visitation for refusal to subscribe were four higher clergy, Robert Pursglove,

Marian Bishop of Hull (whom we shall meet later as a recalcitrant papist living on his manor of Ugthorpe), Alban Langdale, prebendary of Ampleforth and Archdeacon of Lewes (from 1562 on bond to stay in the house of Lord Montague in Sussex, where he had an important career which did not touch the North Riding again), John Hanson, Archdeacon of Richmond (who was a papist exile in Valenciennes in 1571 and died abroad; but can have seen little of Richmond, since, from 1541, the Archdeacon's office there was a sinecure and the work done by a Commissary), and Owen Oglethorpe, rector of Romalldkirk and Marian Bishop of Carlisle (who died in 1559). Thus, in fact, none of these four had exercised any real ministry in the Riding, and only Pursglove lived there after 1559. The Marian Archdeacon of Cleveland, John Warren, a prebendary of York and perhaps also dean of Winchester, did not appear at the 1559 visitation and had resigned the Archdeaconry by 1563, but we have not discovered anything about his religious views. In 1559 the Visitors began proceedings to restore to their livings the survivors of incumbents deprived for marriage in Queen Mary's reign. In the event there seem to have been very few of these restorations. William Bury, a remarkable pluralist, was deprived of the mastership of Nicholas' Hospital, Richmond on these grounds, and similarly of the rectory of Kirkby in Cleveland in 1562. In the same way William Taylor lost the rectory of Bulmer. In neither case is there any indication of their beliefs.⁽¹⁶⁾

Thus the vast majority of incumbents stayed in their benefices in 1559. But how many of them retained Catholic beliefs so strongly that, when later faced with subscription to Protestant formularies (which they had accepted in 1559 or evaded), they refused and were deprived? The history of the evolution of religious tests in Yorkshire from 1559 is far from clear. It seems that from 1559 to Young's metropolitical visitation of 1561, there was only the brief formula used by the 1559 visitors, imposed on all who attended their short-lived court and also on all instituted to benefices. It is quite likely that incumbents who put in no appearance in 1559 and the whole mass of the clerical proletariat—stipendiary curates, domestic chaplains and school-

masters, parish schoolmasters, retired or pensioned or just unemployed clergy—were faced with no test before 1561. In that year's visitation—which may have included the Archdeaconry of Richmond—all incumbents and curates and schoolmasters were summoned. Those instituted or licenced were now and henceforward required to subscribe to a new and much longer formulary, which bears a distinct family resemblance to the Forty-Two and Thirty-Nine Articles. Also all clergy were to subscribe to a 'confession', an expanded form of the 1559 'acknowledgment' and strongly anti-papal. By the Queen's Injunctions of 1559 incumbents were bound to cause quarterly sermons to be preached, which involved the use of definitely Protestant teaching; but that injunction long seems to have been widely disobeyed even by those who can have had no objections to the doctrine. This remained the situation for the rest of our period—though clergy brought before the High Commission and suspect were generally required to take the Oath of Supremacy or undergo the penalties of *praemunire* if they refused. Clergy involved in the 1569 rebellion and pardoned, had, as a condition of their pardon, to take a definitely anti-Catholic Oath. A Statute of 1571 required all incumbents who had been ordained by the Catholic rite in the years before 1559 to read aloud the Synodal (Thirty-Nine) Articles (which had been passed in the Convocations in 1562 but were not yet in ordinary use as doctrinal tests for all clergy) before their congregations and subscribe to them before Christmas 1571 on pain of deprivation for evasion or refusal.⁽¹⁷⁾

In 1565 Thomas Holden was deprived of the vicarage of Stainton, but no reason was stated and he does not seem to have been prosecuted by the High Commission. Anthony Green was a pluralist, rector of Cowesby and also vicar of Bossall (to which latter benefice he was instituted in 1562 after subscription). In 1563 he was admonished to reside and not to preach without archiepiscopal licence. Two years later he was deprived of Bossall—no reason given; in 1567 he was said to have absented himself from Cowesby for the last four years and the following year was deprived of it. We know no more about him. In 1564

Nicholas Stawle, the acting lay schoolmaster of Whenby, was refused all licence to teach in the diocese since his judgment in religious matters was corrupt. The context indicates that his views were Catholic; but we hear no more of him. The same year George White, a clerical schoolmaster at Newburgh Priory, the house of the Bellasis family, was summoned for examination. He seems to have taken evasive action and was still being sought in vain in 1569. It seems significant that three boys educated in the Newburgh school at this time were part of a group of Catholic-minded undergraduates in the 1570's, under suspect tutors first at Jesus College, Cambridge, and then at Caius College. It is also possible that White was the priest of the same name reported to have said Mass at Auckland and Barnard Castle during the 1569 rising.⁽¹⁸⁾ In 1568 there was a not very far-reaching enquiry into North Riding incumbents who were also domestic chaplains. John Preston, Rector of South Kilvington, was 'chaplain in the house of Mr Leonard Dacre'. Yet he seems to have been instituted there—and, if so, with subscription—in 1566 or 1567, and we hear no more of him. John Dickson, rector of Thormanby, was chaplain in the house of Mr Norton at Wath (Norton Conyers—soon to be a great centre of the rebellion)—but we hear no more of him either. Thomas Benson, vicar of Great Edston, was said to be Lord Eure's chaplain at Malton. He was deprived in 1571 for non-residence, but we hear nothing of his religious views, he was not prosecuted for any part in the rising, and the Eures were not then regarded as Catholic-minded.⁽¹⁹⁾ As we shall see in some detail later, the 1569 rising involved a good many North Riding clergy, but few of these were deprived. William Ulvason, curate of Tunstall, Richmondshire, fled from his cure into Lancashire and became a prominent Marian papist 'runagate'. Christopher Beckwith, vicar of Burneston, was so serious an offender that the High Commission remitted him to the Assizes. In 1571, however, he was back in the ecclesiastical court facing proceedings for deprivation, which were then all concluded except for the formal act. Yet, according to the Chester records, he resigned the vicarage in 1582, and we know no more of him. John Acrigg's case is well-documented. He had had a long career

as stipendiary curate to important absentee incumbents—at Wensley to Reginald Hyndmers, domestic chaplain and steward to the Scrope family, then at Kirkby Ravensworth to Dr Dakyns. Early in Elizabeth's reign he had become senior curate at Richmond, and had appeared at the Chester diocesan visitation of 1562—at which, presumably, he had subscribed to the 'Confession'. During the 1569 rising he was reconciled to the Catholic church, and when summoned by the High Commission in 1570 was said to have fled from his cure. He was eventually caught, refused to conform and stayed in gaol at York and Hull until his death in 1585.⁽²⁰⁾ Robert Firbank, curate and schoolmaster of Kirkby Hill fled from there after 1569, and was reported to be hiding in Richmondshire in 1571, reconciling people. William Gargett, priest, of Gilling in Richmondshire, summoned, after the Rising, by the High Commission, also fled and was reported in 1578 to be a runaway papist still hiding in the area. Thomas Bell, curate of Thirsk and only a deacon, had a more remarkable career than any of these men. According to his own account, in the middle of 1570:

. . . being moved in conscience and persuaded in opinion and belief that the religion now established in this realm is not the Catholic religion and true doctrine of Christ, he intended to leave his Orders and forsake the ministry . . . he confesseth that he was persuaded to believe the religion now established not to be Christ's religion by reading of certain books which he had in his custody, one of which books Parkinson (a recusant layman of Thirsk, arrested with him) did lend him, being Alphonsus' book. . . .

He went to Topcliffe, where George Malton, the curate there, agreed with him and, together with the layman, Parkinson, in plain clothes, they set off for London, intending to go abroad. In London they failed to get a ship and were questioned by the magistrates, but escaped by passing themselves off as Oxford scholars. Then they made their way back to Topcliffe, where they were all arrested. Before the High Commission, Malton caved in, but the other two were firm in refusing to conform. Bell admitted that he had been reconciled to the Catholic Church, and affirmed:

. . . that the Pope the Bishop of Rome is supreme head of the Catholic Church and that he would stick to that opinion by God's grace until death. . . .

He compiled in prison a book of the questions put to him by the Commissioners and his answers. Although the authorities siezed the book and put him in the lowest ward of the York Kidcote, he found ways to produce another copy and get it out of prison to circulate round Thirsk amongst his relatives and neighbouring curates. Our next news of Bell is in January 1576 when one of the York Castle servants

. . . did not know when or at what time Bell did go forth of the Castle; And he denieth that he did let him forth of the Castle that night . . . neither did he know of Bell's departure until the morning following. . . .

Bell arrived at the newly opened English College at Douai on 3 February 1576—a bare month after getting away from York—and the College Diary noted that he 'was seduced to Calvinism at Cambridge when young and became a minister; but was converted after reading St Augustine and St Jerome and was in gaol for 6 years'. We shall follow his career later.⁽²¹⁾

William Wallock, curate of Masham, was involved in the 1569 rising, fled from there, ignoring a High Commission summons, and in 1581 was reported to be lurking as a runagate papist at Linton in Craven. Michael Tirry, a lay schoolmaster of Aysgarth, first got into trouble through the rebellion. In two autobiographical documents he has left us a very complete picture. He was a native of Ripgarth, Aysgarth and left school at the age of eighteen. His account of the courses which were then open to him should dispel any prejudices that Wensleydale was then a totally remote backwater. On the one hand he was offered a job in London with a haberdasher—clearly a connection; Sir Christopher Metcalfe of Nappa offered him a benefice if he would get ordained; Michael's brother, who was a cupper in Doncaster, secured for him the offer of the mastership of the free school there. After a visit to London, and another offer of a scrivener's job there, he went to Oxford under the patronage of Mr Edward Hyndmers of his home country. After four years at Trinity

College, he set aside the chance of a fellowship at Balliol, 'disliking the time'. Back in Aysgarth—apparently very shortly before the Rising (though here his rough dates are hard to follow) he acted as a private, unlicensed tutor in the house of Leonard Metcalfe of Bear Park—who was attainted for his part in the rising, but pardoned. Then Tirry applied for a teaching licence to the Archbishop (Grindal) and obtained one—taking the necessary subscription—and was for three years master of Bishop Pursglove's newly-founded school at Guisborough. In June 1571 he was before the High Commission, confessed 'that he did favour the religion . . . now set forth' and willingly offered to swear to the Thirty-Nine Synodal Articles. He was dismissed with an admonition to take his scholars regularly to church. He was examined again by the High Commission in November 1572 and dismissed. In 1573 he left Guisborough for York where he taught for two years. From Christmas 1574 he ceased to go to church or communicate—he admits that until that time he had always been to church and communicated once a year. In June 1575, after he had voluntarily given up his mastership, he was examined by the High Commission, found to be a stiff papist, and remained in gaol in York and Hull continuously until we lose trace of him in 1594. His own account of his conscience is clear; that he was uneasy and uncertain about religion from at least the age of eighteen, but obeyed the laws until 'his conscience were more perfectly instructed'. He implies that he arrived at his final decision alone; he did visit the celebrated Marian priest, Mr Cumberland, but had no conversation with him. He did spend much time visiting Thomas Bell in the Kidcote and helping him to put together his book, but that was mostly after he had made up his own mind. He makes a very explicit declaration of Catholic faith . . .

he supposeth all the principal points of religion are now erroneously taught and the reason hereof . . . is for that the Church of Rome hath otherwise appointed than is now taught in this Church of England, adding further that the Church of Rome is the true Church and that the same hath been known the visible Church of Christ ever since His Ascension. He

refuseth to communicate because he thinketh that the Holy Communion is not the Lord's table: for that the Sacrament is not there in right form and duly ministered: inasmuch as there is neither priest to minister neither any such things ministered as he ought to receive. He . . . affirmeth the Pope (terming him Peter's successor) to be supreme head of the universall Catholic Church.⁽²²⁾

This may not be the complete tale of clergy and schoolmasters deprived as a result of the 1569 rising. There are three others whom we cannot identify clearly—John Fielden (later reported a runagate papist) and William Wilson and William Baynes of 'Cayton', clerks, who all fled rather than obey a High Commission summons. Baynes was later reported a runagate in Craven and then conformed.⁽²³⁾

In 1571 began the curious case of Bartholomew Carus, rector of Wycliffe. He had been curate there from 1548 and rector (through the Wycliffe family) from 1551 and was not implicated in the rising of 1569. His name is not amongst those who evaded the visitors in 1559 and he may well have subscribed to the 'confession' in the Chester visitation of 1562. In 1571 he came under the terms of the Statute requiring subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles from 'old priests'. But meanwhile the York High Commission had received a highly alarmist informer's report on popery in Richmondshire, in which he figured. He was summoned to answer charges that:

- i. he has not yet subscribed to the Articles of Religion and has no testimonial (to that effect) from the ordinary;
- ii. he has avoided celebrating the Communion service, or, when he has celebrated it, he himself has not communicated;
- iii. he has himself said Masses and heard Masses said by a priest in his house;
- iv. he has secretly consulted in his house with runagate priests like Bovell, Boyce, Morton and Taylor;
- v. he has often heard auricular confessions and himself been absolved in confession;
- vi. he himself has been reconciled to the Roman Church,

knows others who have been reconciled, who are reconcilers and where they are to be found.

In court Carus at first refused to be sworn to answer these charges, but relented after a short time in gaol. Either the charges were exaggerated greatly, or the court could obtain no real evidence, for the offences were now grave civil crimes, yet Carus was not handed over to the Assizes nor forthwith deprived. He was released to return to his cure, to make the necessary statutory declarations of the Articles and certify the fact. In March 1572 he sent in a certificate which was accepted and the bond destroyed. Yet seven years later, in September 1579, in the York Chancery court, he was deprived of his benefice summarily, on the grounds that he had, in fact, never made the declaration, that he had been absent from his cure for the last two years, 'and hideth himself as a suspected papist so that it is not known where he is'. We hear no more of him.⁽²⁴⁾

In 1587 a seminary priest, Lancelot Blackburne, when examined, maintained that he had been schoolmaster of Topcliffe, his native place, until about 1573. Certainly the schoolmaster of Topcliffe in 1573, Henry Orton, was a suspect non-communicant who eventually conformed in 1575, but was again arrested as a suspect papist in 1577 and then vanishes from sight.⁽²⁵⁾ Also in 1573 Thomas Wilkinson, vicar of Aysgarth, was deprived, but the cause is not apparent. Christopher Robinson, rector of West Rounton, was deprived in July 1576, because he was an 'old priest' and had refused to subscribe to the Articles. Finally, in the 1590's, there were the cases of three schoolmasters—Thomas Poole of Bedale, deprived for recusancy in 1599, Miles Lodge of Guisborough wanted by the High Commission in 1593 and said to have fled away (it is likely that he was the Miles Lodge of the diocese of York who entered the English College, Rome, some two months later and died in the course of his studies for the priesthood there), and Robert Cuthbert of Manfield, reported in 1595 to have deserted his post and to be a vagrant recusant.⁽²⁶⁾

This run through what appears to be the surviving evidence for deprivations of North Riding clergy and schoolmasters in the

first two generations from 1558 has given us a total of sixteen certainties (eleven clergy and five lay schoolmasters) and another five possibilities (four clergy, one layman)—equally balanced between Richmondshire and the rest of the Riding.

As we have seen, the great majority of the clergy deprived for Catholicism were ordained by the Latin Ordinal in use before the introduction of Edward VI's Ordinal and also from 1556 to 1559. They therefore formed a small part of a large class who, early in the 1560's, came to be called variously 'pontificals', 'old priests', 'Queen Mary priests'. As such they were distinct from those ordained by the Prayer Book Ordinals before and after Mary's reign, from such of the Marian Protestant exiles (like Dean Whittingham of Durham) as were ordained abroad by Protestant rites, and from Catholics ordained by Catholic bishops in Ireland or on the Continent after 1559. They were a large class—indeed in 1559 they certainly formed the great majority of the Yorkshire clergy, and Archbishops Young, Grindal and Sandys were all 'old' priests. Until 1540 the clerical population of Yorkshire had been relatively high, and the dissolution of the religious houses and chantries seems to have thrown many clerical unemployed or part-time employed on to an already crowded ecclesiastical labour market. From 1540 to 1570 the surviving York ordination lists are only a shadow of earlier ones, and thereafter, although the lists lengthened, they never reached the ample proportions of pre-1540. Marian Catholic bishops had suffered, on the other hand, from a shortage of clergy—presumably due to death, flight and the disorders of the times. After 1559 Anglican bishops had to face a similar shortage and the average age of the clergy must, by then, have been relatively high. In March 1566 there appears in the *York Institution Book* 'Injunctions to be confessed and subscribed by them that shalbe admitted to Readers . . . (only to read services, bury, church women, keep the parish Register) . . . I shall not read but in pore parishes destitute of Incumbents, except in time of sickness' (27) 'Old' priests were slowly dying out—by 1571 they were clearly in a distinct minority in incumbencies. But meanwhile their services were essential to the Anglican authorities, even though Protestants had their doubts

about them. Extreme Puritans, like Whittingham, tended to regard an 'old priest' as no minister of the Word until he had been called or reordained. The few incumbent 'old priests' who had had Edwardine Orders and then had sought Catholic reordination in Mary's reign were regarded with especial disfavour. The Statute of 1571, which imposed on 'old priests' alone a special subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles, was not merely a police measure due to the 1569 rising; the records of the deprivations of those who refused the subscription, and of the Archbishop's chaplains' examination of incumbents in 1571 show a general suspicion of 'old priests', however conformist, as so long 'bred another way' as to be capable of believing and serving as ministers only with considerable difficulty. But we shall deal later with the evidence of residual Catholic or conservative religious habits amongst the 'old priests' of the Riding in general; immediately we are concerned only with such of them as carried their conservatism to the point of living a detached and harried life as Catholic nonconformists. In the whole county we have collected evidence of some 150 to 160 of these, of whom some perhaps fifty to sixty had been deprived (or voluntarily quitted, often after long hesitation) of cures of some sort in the county; the other 90 to 100 seem, as far as our evidence shows, to have been outsiders—Yorkshiremen originally holding cures elsewhere in England and drifted home after deprivation or flight, natives of neighbouring counties, Scots priests. Of these there were about forty who, at one time or another, frequented the North Riding—though their lives seem often to have been so widely peripatetic that it is hard to allot numbers of them by Ridings or even counties. Of these forty, nine or ten had been deprived of North Riding cures. Making allowances for silences and gaps in the evidence, it does seem, at the moment, likely that these priests appeared in rather fewer numbers in the North than in the West Riding.⁽²⁸⁾

To Catholic historians of the recent past, these priests were an essential link in the continuity of Catholicism in England, who held the fort until the arrival of the seminary priests; indeed, the seminaries themselves were the work of 'old priests' headed by

Cardinal Allen. Of late there has been a strong tendency amongst professional historians to criticise this view and to suggest that, granted a small personal continuity between Marian Catholicism and Elizabethan Tridentine Catholicism, otherwise there was a discontinuity of movements; that the 'old priests' of the 1560's were far more akin to the Henrician conservatives of 1534-58 than to the seminary priests; that the militant Catholicism of the 1580's was, very largely indeed in personnel, and almost totally in *ethos*, both amongst clergy and laity, remote from the confused conservatism fairly common in the 1560's. A variant of this hypothesis would suggest that there is a line of descent in ideas and outlook from the Henrician conservatives to the 'old priests' of the 1560's and so to the 'Appellant' party of the 1590's. In any case, the new view would want to stress the complexity of the religious situation in the 1560's, to underline evidence that there was then, throughout English society, a powerful undertow of 'neutralist' feeling, desire to have time to think out a position before making any adhesion of faith to any establishment—evidence that there was then a notable group of clergy and laity whom both definite Protestants and definite Catholics regarded with distrust as 'atheists', 'neuters', and whose spasmodic and violent gestures of contempt for the liturgy of the established Church were ambiguous. Does an examination of the evidence on the North Riding nonconformist 'old priests' cast any light on this matter?

In the first place the evidence of apparently Protestant or 'neutral' nonconformism amongst clergy before the later 1590's is scanty throughout the county. The few best documented cases—of Melchior Smith and Thomas Fugall, vicars of Hessle and Hull (1567, 1561), of Robert Dalton, clerk (of no specified place, 1564), of Robert Salven, rector of Barnbrough (1562-70) and Anthony Atkinson, unemployed clerical tutor (1564-85)—do not belong to the North Riding. Certainly a reading of some of their cases leaves one with a feeling that there was a strand of neutralism ranging from the beatnik to the plain bewildered, and not easily to be fitted into the categories of Catholic-Anglican-Calvinist-Brownist. It is evident also that the cases in the court

books do not represent quite all the men who caused the authorities trouble.⁽²⁹⁾ The books only have four cases which might show neutralism in the Riding. The first is of William Todd, prebendary of Durham, archdeacon of Bedford and vicar of Northallerton in Mary's reign. He appears to have refused to subscribe at Durham in 1559 and his canonry was sequestered. He resigned the vicarage of Northallerton in 1561. According to Strype he voted solidly on the ultra-Protestant side in the Convocation of 1562; he certainly still held his prebend of Durham, which was his at his death in 1567. In October 1564 he was summoned from Durham to the York High Commission; after a long case, in October 1566 the Commission inhibited him from all ministry 'used in the Church of England' henceforward, ordered him to 'go in lay attire' and stay in a house at Croxdale, Co. Durham. He does not appear in the Catholic Bridgewater's lists of Catholic clergy sufferers (1587). The second case is of Francis Grene, rector of Birkby in Allertonshire, who was several times before the High Commission from 1568 for misbehaviour during services and not wearing a surplice. That year he was dismissed as 'a man that doth earnestly favour God's word . . . and detesteth all papistry'. There is nothing in the short records of his case to imply that he was not just a Puritan and that we should be justified in taking these words as implying that the Commissioners had felt him to be an undeterminate neutral who might be a hidden papist. The third case is of William Barker, curate of Richmond, in 1585—clearly a violent Puritan. The fourth was Robert Pala, rector of Stokesley and Kirkby in Cleveland (and later also of Burton Agnes) who, in 1564, was ordered not to preach in the diocese until further order was taken with him, and when he did preach, to do so decently and use the accustomed prayers for the Queen. But he seems to have run into no further trouble and died an incumbent in 1575.⁽³⁰⁾

Ten of the 'nonconformist' Marian priests in the Riding were men of distinction. Documentary evidence (Protestant, and admittedly some twenty years after the event) has lately been found, that the great Dr William Allen (deprived of the mastership of St Mary's Hall, Oxford, for Catholicism, and later founder

of the seminary priest movement and a Cardinal) himself stayed at Hutton Bonville and reconciled people to the Catholic Church there. Allen did spend two years in England (1562-4) after his first period of exile at Louvain, and although he appears to have spent a good deal of that time in his native Lancashire, it is quite likely that he visited Allertonshire—especially since his relations and close friends, the Grimston and Hawksworth families, owned houses in Hutton Bonville and Little Smeaton and were often there in the 1560's. However it seems that Allen was not ordained priest until his return to the Continent, in 1565.⁽³¹⁾ Dr Nicholas Morton of Bawtry, a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge and Marian canon of Canterbury, was deprived for Catholicism in 1559. By 1562 he was living in the English Hospice at Rome with other English exiles. In 1569 he came to England on a very brief visit, leaving just before the rising of the Earls began. In 1572 the Earl of Northumberland admitted that Morton had visited him once—presumably at Topcliffe. Morton, he said, had avoided speaking of politics, but had 'lamented he saw so great want of sound and catholick priests that he might give authority to them for reconciling such of the people as would seek it'. In 1571 the York High Commissioners had received an information that Morton was one of six priests reconciling in Richmondshire, with faculties from Rome; it was said that Morton 'roveth from place to place and hath bene lately in Roome'. It may well be true that he had found time to act in this way in Richmondshire in 1569—but for a very short time, and he was certainly back in Rome long before 1571. Although Strype had seen documents which credited Morton with at least one later visit to Yorkshire, the records of the English Hospice at Rome seem to make this unlikely. The memory of the visits of Allen and Morton to the Riding certainly lingered in the minds of some local Protestants as the source of the papist menace of later years. But we may suspect that this impression owed more to the general repute of the two men, by the 1580's, as prominent northern exiles, than to any missionary activities of theirs.⁽³²⁾

Robert Pursglove, another of these distinguished 'old priests',

was a very different case. As a young man he had been a disciple of the English humanists, was a late vocation to the Gilbertines, and became prior of Guisborough and suffragan Bishop of Hull shortly before the dissolution of the priory in 1540. He received a substantial pension and the prior's demesne manor of Ugthorpe, and remained an active ecclesiastical administrator in York throughout the turbulent years 1540-53. Thus he was ordaining for the Archbishop in 1547 (he then ordained priest John Rokeby, later vicar-general of the diocese). In 1551-3 he was still ordaining (by the Edwardine Ordinal), mostly at the parochial chapels of Ugthorpe, Egton and Lythe. There seems to be no evidence that he did anything but conform to the Edwardine religious settlements. He was reconciled to the Catholic Church in Mary's reign and continued a pillar of the York ecclesiastical administration. Yet in 1559, apparently without hesitation, he ventured on the first great act of disobedience to royal authority of his life, refused subscription and was deprived. In June 1561 he was granted licence by letters patent to found a grammar school at Guisborough. It is on account of this action—which inevitably involved placing the school under Archbishop Young's control—that at least one Catholic historian judged him to have lapsed from Catholicism or become a 'neuter' by 1561. But in that same year Pursglove was included in a list of stiff papists put under bond—in his case to remain within a twelve-mile radius of Ugthorpe; the official comment on him was 'very wealthy, stiff in papistry & of estimation in the country'.⁽³³⁾ Also in August 1566 the York High Commission bound him in a new recognisance 'not to presume anything by teaching, preaching, open talking etc. sinisterly to the disturbance of the Queen's Majesty's laws . . . in religion and to abide in the diocese of York or in Derbyshire'. Apart from a general recognition by the Commission that he was regarded by them as a definite recusant, this bond pretty certainly reflects his desire now to move from Ugthorpe to Tideswell in Derbyshire—apparently his native ground. In November 1559 he had obtained a licence to alienate his capital messuage, called New Hall, in Ugthorpe to what appears to be a family trust of Pursgloves living in Ugthorpe, Tideswell and elsewhere. Then in

February 1565 he sold the manor of Ugthorpe to the Radcliffe family. He seems to have had other property interests, particularly at Howsham in the East Riding which he disposed of in 1573.⁽³⁴⁾ Another reason for not taking his foundation articles of Guisborough grammar school as clear evidence of conformity is the behaviour of John Feckenham, the very clearly Catholic deprived abbot of Westminster, who—while a prisoner—maintained two scholars at Cambridge (one or both of whom became Anglican incumbents) and signed, with the Harpsfield brothers, a denial of the Pope's power to dispense Englishmen from their allegiance in civil matters to the Queen. Also it is a fact that at both Guisborough and Tideswell, his two schools, clergy and schoolmasters became recusants. He lived at Tideswell until his death in 1579, and there is some evidence of his religious views at this period. A direct evidence is an anonymous Catholic writer of 1588 who says expressly that Pursglove and Alban Langdale advised Catholics to go to the Anglican church, that both 'to their last howers' went to church, and speaks of 'Mr Pursgloves imperfections . . . who in deede was in the beginning of the late schisme exceeding farre out of the way and never could be reclaymed perfectly until his death . . .', he was accounted by Catholics a schismatic and 'scandalous newter' and kept many in schism. There is indirect evidence in the fact that Bridgewater, in his *Concertatio* (1587), omits Pursglove's (but not Alban Langdale's) name from his very detailed calendar of Catholics of all kinds who had suffered in any way for the Faith. But if we remember that definitely Catholic 'old priests' like the Harpsfields and Feckenham could reject the Pope's dispensing power and practice, and accept frequenting of the Universities and attendance at Protestant sermons so as to refute their doctrine; if we note that the Catholic critic of Pursglove quoted above was a passionate partisan in a controversy amongst English Catholics which was, in practice, still regarded by many as undecided in 1579; if we note also that the critic's opponents in reality were not justifying full interior conformity, but only physical presence at Protestant services, without participation, and that only under compulsion—it becomes much harder to accept this evidence as

any real proof that Pursglove had ceased to be a Catholic or had become a theological 'neutral'. He remains a fascinating case, of whom we should like to know much more.⁽³⁵⁾

The anonymous informer of 1571 reported the presence, as a reconciler, in Richmondshire, of Sir Humphrey Nattres 'a verie olde man laite of the howse of Peterborowe and in great creditt emongest the Reconcilers'. Nattres was a monk and sub-sexton of the monastery of Peterborough at its dissolution; he then held the benefice of Paston, Northamptonshire, from October 1548 until he resigned it in October 1552. In 1554-5 he was chaplain to his old abbot, Chambers, now Bishop of Peterborough. We hear no more of him. Henry Bovell was also reported to be reconciling in Richmondshire in 1571, and to be conspiring on behalf of Mary of Scots. As a prebendary of Southwell he had refused subscription in 1559 and was deprived by 1562. This is all we know of his career. Anthony Salvin was rector of Sedgfield, Co. Durham, and prebendary of Durham, and deprived by 1560 for refusing subscription. In 1561 he was, as a stubborn papist, put under bond to stay in Kirkby Moorside 'or elsewhere, but not beyond five miles north of' there, the city of York excepted. This suggests that he was living with Christopher Neville at Kirkby. But the York court books make no mention of him, and in 1569, when Kirkby was a storm centre of the Earls' rising, there seems to be no reference to him. More active, and spoken of as if they formed a team, were Drs Carter and Sedgwick. Dr William Carter became Archdeacon of Northumberland in November 1558, refused to subscribe in 1559, was deprived, and confined to a radius of ten miles round Thirsk in 1561. Dr Thomas Sedgwick was a Cambridge theologian who seems to have played a prominent part in the Marian restoration of Catholicism; in 1561 he was restricted to a narrow radius round Richmond. A series of wills of Richmondshire people between 1561 and 1568—including Dr George Nevill of Well, Dame Christine Burgh, ex-prioress of Nunkeeling and living in Richmond (as was Alice Sedgwick, one of her nuns and very possibly a relation of the doctor), Ralph Gower, Esq., of Richmond—indicate pretty clearly that the doctors were a very respected part of a group of

people of consequence with decidedly conservative religious views. A furious letter to Sir Robert Cecil in February 1570 from York outright accuses Carter and Sedgwick ('two arch-priests and doctors') of being the main fomenters of the rebellion in the towns where they lived, very obstinate papists, and cleverly using the terms of the bonds of 1561 as a cover for refusing to obey summonses to court in York. In fact Sedgwick was committed to York Castle as a complete and obstinate recusant in March 1571; later in the year his health gave out and he was allowed to live under restraint in York, and he died in gaol there in 1573. Carter was more fortunate. His case peters out in the High Commission records early in 1571; later that year he arrived at the English College, Douai, and remained in exile until his death. The treatment which both men received from the High Commission and the absence of civil proceedings against them indicate that they must have behaved with great circumspection during the 1569 rising.⁽³⁶⁾

The two other notabilities amongst the nonconformist 'old priests' were 'Mr Copley' and Dr Thomas Marshall. Shortly before 1569 the Earl of Northumberland—most likely at Topcliffe, then his normal residence—was, according to his own account, reconciled to the Catholic Church by 'Mr Copley'. (Yet, as we shall see, the Earl most likely already had one or more conservative 'old priest' chaplains there, who cannot have had faculties to reconcile, or who themselves, very possibly, judged in conscience that they needed reconciliation.) In 1571 the band of reconcilers supposed to be working in Richmondshire included 'Copley'. We know nothing else with certainty about this priest. Marshall was deprived in 1560 of the deanery of Christchurch, Oxford, and the following year thought to be a dangerous papist, lurking in the houses of the Earl of Cumberland and his brother-in-law, Metcalfe of Nappa, Aysgarth. He reached the English College at Douai by 1575, and had probably been in Louvain since at least 1571.⁽³⁷⁾

These ten seem to have been the only known priests of real weight and influence amongst the nonconformist 'pontificales' of the Ridings. As we have seen, so far as the patchy evidence goes,

all of them except Pursglove (though Anthony Salvin is a shadowy figure) were pretty definitely strong papists—and Pursglove's case is surely not yet closed. But all ten had a severely limited—if locally and occasionally strong—influence in the Riding. All were dead or gone from the county by 1572.

Behind them stood some twenty-seven to thirty lesser figures. Nine of them were deprived of cures in the Riding—George White, William Gargett, Robert Firbank, William Ustanson, Robert Williamson, Richard Salvin, William Wallock, William Baynes and Bartholomew Carus—as we have seen. Whatever their hesitations, there seems to be no evidence that they were anything but strong religious conservatives and regarded by the York authorities as 'runagate papist priests'. It would be perilous to attribute to one and the same priest half a dozen references to 'George White clerk', but an 'old priest' of that name was committed by the Council of the North (in itself, surely, a significant fact) to York Castle in 1588 as a recusant. It seems likely that Gargett lurked as a runagate round Gilling—possibly with the recusant Mrs Gascoigne of Sedbury—until about 1578–80 and died in York Castle in about 1580. Firbank was accounted one of the band of reconcilers in Richmondshire in 1571, and seems to have died in York Castle in 1586. Ustanson was reported to be sheltered in the houses of gentry in Lancashire in 1571–2. By 1575 he had been arrested, and was successively in the Peter prison at York, the Castle and Hull blockhouses, causing a good deal of trouble by having Catholic books in gaol and instructing children and converts there. He was exiled to the Continent in a batch of priest prisoners in 1585. Williamson's case is obscured in the records, but at least we get a glimpse of a papist old priest of that surname sharing Ustanson's prison experiences, causing the same troubles to the authorities and exiled with him. Salvin, as we have seen, was dead—most likely still in Cleveland—by 1571. Wallock was still round Masham in May 1570, was lurking as a popish runagate in Craven in 1581, and then we hear no more of him. Baynes, as a 'popish vagrant priest', lurked with his brother near Ingleton in the West Riding until 1578; in 1580 he was living at Leck near Tunstall in

Richmondshire, was caught, and, as 'an olde popishe preiste supposed to be a seducer of the people from true religion, having himself longe tyme refused the church and communion', conferred with Dean Hutton and agreed to enter bond in November 1580 to behave dutifully and go to church—'the communion excepted'. Nevertheless he soon certified his complete conformity and we hear no more of him. We have already followed Bartholomew Carus's career. Thus by 1580 the North Riding knew no more of these nine priests.⁽³⁸⁾

Some of the 'outsider' North Riding 'old priests' emerge from the records with a startling clarity. Hugh Ile was ordained priest by the Latin rite by Cuthbert Tunstall, the Marian Bishop of Durham, in his manorial chapel at Bishop Auckland on 11 March 1559. That was in Queen Elizabeth's reign and shortly before the passing of the Elizabethan religious settlement. Ile's title for ordination was provided by William Smith of Eshe, Co. Durham. We next hear of him acting as a secret Catholic missionary, baptising at Thirsk in 1592 or 1593. He was probably already ensconced by the recusant Christopher Conyers of Hutton Bonville as his chaplain. An information written sometime between 1589 and 1592 says that Conyers was maintaining his own papist priest and chapel. In 1605 Ile married members of two Catholic gentry families at a house in Lowsey Hill, Hutton Bonville. Thomas Meynell, one of the parties, recorded in his commonplace book that Ile was 'a vertuous Queen Marie preist' maintained by the squire of Hutton. It had occurred to Meynell that a York ecclesiastical court would be unable to contest the validity of such a marriage, since a Queen Mary priest was a legal minister. In 1609 both the marriages were called in question in the York Chancery court, Ile's letters of orders were produced in court and the marriages recognised as valid. But an incidental result was the arrest of Ile. However, in 1611 the Quarter Sessions presentments of recusants in Hutton contain 'Sir Hugh the old Preist and Isabel his servant'. Meynell says that he died at Hutton.⁽³⁹⁾ Henry Stapper was a fellow of University College, Oxford, ordained in 1558. He lost his fellowship for his Catholicism and was reported to be a popish priest harboured in Craven

in 1580. At some subsequent date he was arrested in Richmondshire, betrayed by an apostate Catholic, but was at large in 1593. In 1609 he was on the strength of the mission priest establishment in Yorkshire, and a few years later performed a marriage secretly in one of the Pudsey family houses in Richmondshire. Thomas Mudd was a Cistercian monk of Jervaulx until the dissolution of the house, and then went to Scotland. He was back in Yorkshire during Queen Mary's reign teaching children at Knaresborough. Early in the next reign he was a chaplain to the Earl of Northumberland at Topcliffe. Northumberland's account of his own conversion contains no reference to him—perhaps to shelter Mudd, or perhaps because Mudd himself at the time had no faculties to reconcile others. From 1569 to 1579 he passed from house to house amongst friends, and the High Commission seems to have been ignorant of his existence. He was arrested at Boroughbridge in 1579, in company with a York 'old priest' who had just returned to England from a theological course at Douai. Mudd remained in prisons in York and Hull until his death in 1583.⁽⁴⁰⁾ Nicholas Green—perhaps a Lincolnshireman and former chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford—was arrested in October 1569. No indication of place is given in the High Commission record, other than the fact that the sureties for his bond to appear in court were John Thwing of Over Helmsley (who was then about to engage himself in the Earls' rising, to be attainted and flee into exile in Flanders) and Marmaduke Grimston of Little Smeaton (a strong papist, relation and friend of Cardinal Allen). Green's answers to the court were unsatisfactory and he was gaoled in York. It seems that he died after five years in the Ousebridge, York. Thomas Rydeall, who was very probably a deprived vicar of Bramham (West Riding), moved round the county and was arrested in Richmondshire some time before his death in a York gaol in 1587. He was accounted by the informers a very busy runagate papist priest missionary. George Raynes, who had been ordained by Bishop Tunstall with Hugh Ile in 1559, is reputed to have gone abroad and become a Carmelite at Mechlin and returned to the Yorkshire mission in the 1590's. By then he was certainly on the mission at Barforth in Richmond-

shire. Thomas Meynell, who was married to his first wife there by him, accounted him a 'vertuous Queen Marie preist' and noted that he 'after dyed happely in York Castle'. He was arrested in 1593 in Nottinghamshire.⁽⁴¹⁾

The rest of the North Riding 'old priests' are more shadowy figures—John Bolton, deprived of a curacy at Hedon and reputed to be reconciling in Richmondshire in 1571; but more likely to have spent twenty years in York and Hull prisons before being deported to the Continent in 1585; Thomas White, Sir Michael Myers, 'Boyce' (perhaps William Boyce, rector of Guiseley and deprived for Catholicism in 1559–60, sought by the High Commission in 1572–3) and 'Taylor' (apparently still operating in the 1580's, perhaps in Allertonshire) were all reputed to be reconciling in Richmondshire in 1571. Ninian Atkinson, clerk, was sought by the High Commissioners after the 1569 rising, and in 1593 the Earl of Huntingdon's list of papist 'old priests' still at large in the county included 'Sir Ninny Atkinson'. There was Sir Henry Oglethorpe, a papist—there seems to have been no seminary priest of that name and the title is significant—baptising round Thirsk in 1593, Francis Smith (late parson of Crowle in Lincolnshire) who was a papist runagate marrying recusants before 1603 at Saxton (W.R.) and in 1605 at Little Smeaton in Allertonshire, William Wilkinson (at Myton on Swale in 1573, later taken saying Mass in York, gaoled and exiled), 'little Sir William' of 'beside Malton' in 1560–2 (reported to have said Mass for Lady Lennox at Settrington), William Walker (a native of Welburn, a papist old priest found in Northamptonshire and in the Poultry Counter prison in London in 1581–3). The presentments of the laity in the years before the seminary priests arrived show a thin sprinkling of accusations of sheltering runagate papist priests—at Skelton in Cleveland in 1594 (old 'old priest' thought to be now dead), at Masham in 1571 (the parish clerk sheltering priests and hearing Masses), at Wycliffe in 1571–2, at Hawnby the same year.⁽⁴²⁾

This survey of the nonconformist 'pontificales' of the Riding does little to answer our problem. So far as the scanty court book evidence goes, the York authorities regarded them all as

papists. To what extent any of them required reconciliation we hardly know in detail. The one significant record here—though it is a hearsay record which we have seen to be inaccurate in part on its facts—is the information about reconcilers in Richmondshire in 1571, which divides the priests into two groups of those with faculties to reconcile and those ‘reconciled, and perswadeth the people to the same, but not as yeat auctorised’. Ten were gaoled and held steadfastly to their Catholic faith, only one is known to have apostatised. Five (apart from those deported in 1585, who were received as Catholic priests by the exiles) went overseas, of whom three (Allen, Morton and Rydeall) returned to the mission. Death and capture reduced their numbers to about seven after 1580–2.

Next we come to cases of conservative or Catholic leanings amongst incumbents who nevertheless remained conformists in their benefices. It is not easy here to distinguish genuine cases of this from Puritan leanings, moral failings, sheer ignorance and carelessness. Although it has been established that the Elizabethan parochial clergy by the 1590’s contained a larger élite of well-read, resident and well-off men (it is suggested, with some justice that marriage helped) than had been the case in the 1550’s, during our period the clerical proletariat may well—due to contemporary inflation, the all-prevailing system of lay impropriations and the absence of invested endowments—have been more beggared than they had been in the 1520’s. What, for instance, are we to make of the case of Thomas Betson, clerk, who, in March 1564, was put to public penance at Croft, Richmond, Northallerton, Yarm and Gilling for ‘conjuring’? Or there are the difficulties of interpreting the case of George Hutchinson clerk of Middleton Tyas against Thomas Scott parson of Langton and vicar of Catterick, in 1585–9. Hutchinson accused Scott of refusing to wear a surplice or use the Prayer Book in baptisms. Scott countered by accusing Hutchinson of having resigned his vicarage at Middleton to live as an apostate from his calling and as a layman, long a non-communicant, a swearer, Sabbath-breaker and contemner of ‘the better sort of ministers of the word in Richmondshire’?⁽⁴³⁾ Before 1569 there are very few cases

identifiable as clerical conservatism—the curates of Croft and Kirkleavington penanced for keeping superstitious images, the curate of Middleham wearing a stole, the curate of South Cowton baptising in suspicious circumstances, the curate of Danby in Cleveland keeping vestments, the curate of Cocken in Bransdale inhibited for mumbling the services (that is, as if he were using the Latin Mass and Office). This list is much shorter than those for the other two Ridings in these years. On the other hand, the Earls' rebellion of 1569 made its impact almost exclusively in the North Riding, and we should have expected that it would act as a forcing-house for hitherto concealed conservative views amongst the clergy. The High Commission observed that sixty-three North Riding parish churches and chapels had had their Anglican service books removed or destroyed during the rebellion. Thirty-eight of the Riding's clergy were summoned to court to face charges connected with the rising; six were incumbents, twenty-seven curates and five apparently unemployed. The Patent Rolls list of those who were allowed—and sued for—pardons includes two more clergy who do not appear in the Commission's list. They were Christopher Holden of Danby Wiske and Thomas Taylor of Langton on Swale. Of the thirty-eight called by the Commission, ten fled and we have already noticed their later careers; one (Christopher Beckwith, vicar of Burneston, whose case we have seen) was eventually deprived; he and Christopher Hutchinson, curate of Richmond, were sent to the Assizes; two—John Greenwood, curate of Wilton and Edmund Barker, curate of Ayton Magna—subscribed to the 1562 Synodal Articles, took the Oath of Supremacy and were dismissed; four or five were put in gaol briefly and dismissed on payment of a fine. We hear nothing of prosecutions of the rest and only in a few cases are the precise offences named. The vicar and curate of Kirkby Fletham, the curate of Bedale and the curate of Hipswell had said Mass in their churches; Thomas More of Richmond had either said Mass, or been present at High Mass, in Ripon Minster. The curate of Middleton on Leaven had tried to dissuade his fellows from marriage.⁽⁴⁴⁾

After 1570 the list of cases of clerical conservatism becomes

very meagre again. In 1571 the vicar of Grinton and curate of Askrigg were called to account for the presence of 'monuments of superstition' in their parishes. Neither case seems to have been very serious. The following year the provocative 'book' of Thomas Bell of Thirsk was smuggled back from his gaol to his home country. The distributors were Bell's brother, Henry Bell, a layman of Carlton Husthwaite and Christopher Lockwood of Sowerby. From them it reached the curate of South Kilvington, who made a copy for himself. We hear no more of the book. In 1573-5 Francis Ellerker, the incumbent of Kirkby Misperton, was in trouble and the Archbishop put in a curate—in effect suspended Ellerker. Like so much in the High Commission records, the case is full of unexplained details, but we suspect that Ellerker was simply a violent and unstable character, perhaps with some conservative prejudices. In 1574 John Pickering, curate of Arkendale, was admonished to marry only after banns and 'observe the order of the Communion book'. In 1575 William Allen, curate of Guisborough, was accused of having said that the Pope was the head of the Church and not the Queen. He had already been before the Commission for some unspecified trouble in 1569, and now he utterly denied the charge. The outcome of the case does not appear and we hear no more of him. Finally, long after that, comes the case of Anthony Johnson, rector of Richmond, in 1590. In 1585 he had had a sharp brush with a curate who had accused him of popish practices—in a case where the evidence, as it stands, seems clearly to indicate that the accuser was a rabid Puritan. But in 1590 several parishioners refused to communicate at Johnson's hands, on the grounds that he was teaching the doctrine of transubstantiation and had said in a sermon that his people should 'come and receive their Maker under the form of bread and wine'. There were also other points of doctrine (not specified unfortunately) where he was said to have erred. Johnson was ordered to make a public declaration from the pulpit that he had not maintained transubstantiation. He agreed to do so, but protested that he had no recollection of having used the offending words. There seems to have been no more action against him than this, now or later.

At least on the surface, this looks like a simple collision between strong Protestantism and a quite unconscious use of Catholic terminology still hanging on when its doctrinal substance had gone. But we really know little of the case, and the court seems to have ignored the other doctrinal charges against Johnston.⁽⁴⁵⁾

Priests' wills of this period and wills of others connected with them certainly reveal in general an appreciable amount of clerical religious conservatism in men who do not figure in the ecclesiastical courts. It is not easy to assess what the evidence amounts to in terms of beliefs—as opposed to physical habits of mind. Indeed, we wonder whether that distinction itself is of much use when applied to the religious situation of those years. Surely the generality of men, laity and country clergy especially, both before 1534 and for long after the sixteenth century, lived by a 'folk religion' in which the element of reflection and conscious individual choice was very slight, and the element of unthinking dependence on existing religious institutions and the settled traditional ways of society great. In fact these institutions, liturgies, customs—both of pre-1534 Catholicism and of seventeenth and eighteenth century Anglicanism—taught a faith to the ordinary man. It seems that for the generality of people, at least between 1534 and the 1580's, the visible framework of religious life was shattered and slowly recast in another way. It took time—two generations—for the new framework to settle down and have its full effect. In the intervening years we should expect to find a minority struggling to do what the past had not prepared them for—to maintain a faith as the result of an individual choice, very largely unsustained by institutions and a solid framework of social habits; this would be true both of definite Catholics and definite Protestants. But the great mass of men would be trying to live in terms at once of ancient Catholic habits of mind and gesture (steadily losing their force, since they were left in a void, deprived of their centres, the Mass and liturgy and public Catholic life and its normal expressions) and new ways and institutions, still not very effective.

Changes between 1534 and the 1580's in the wording and

character of wills do seem to reflect this situation. Wills before 1534 in wording and character were religious documents, in a very direct way bound up with the Mass, Requiems, shrines, chantries, the sacrament of Penance, even religious houses. The wills were all in terms of beliefs which were sustained by those institutions. Between 1534 and 1552 the institutions were pretty completely destroyed and only restored very briefly and minimally between 1554 and 1558. Inevitably, therefore, the structure of wills was disrupted, whatever the views of the testators. For a minority the preamble became a very individual profession of personal faith—in the explicit Protestant verging on a sermon on Justification and Election, in the explicit Catholic becoming a profession of a personal Catholic faith which could no longer refer to, or rely on, Catholic institutions and accepted social practice. But for the great majority the surviving remnants of the Catholic structure of a will (the preamble—I bequeath my soul to God Almighty, blessed Mary Mother of God ever a virgin and to all the celestial company of heaven beseeching them to pray for me—and bequests, or a bequest of the residue, to someone to pray for me or ‘for the health of my soul’, with provision for a maximum attendance and prayers at the funeral) were progressively watered down as faith embedded in habit became mere habit and habit was eroded by more and more explicit outside pressures. The preamble shrank, our Lady vanished, the celestial Company sometimes became part of a hope of Election before vanishing in turn. It had often been a late medieval practice to incorporate into the preamble a profession of dependence on the Passion of our Lord—in no way thereby, for a Catholic, contradicting an appeal to the intercession of the living and the saints. Here and there after the 1550’s this reference remained and could be made the high point by explicit Catholics or turned into an expression of Justification by Faith alone, not merits, by explicit Protestants. The requests for the prayers of the living (including bequests of rosaries, sums to be distributed to the poor for prayers) faded into a residue left ‘for the health of my soul’, which came to be interpreted solely as charity or restitution. Even the rosaries, we suspect, could—at any rate for a generation

or two within a family not yet explicitly Protestant—become heirlooms only.

Of some fifty surviving wills of North Riding priests made between 1559 and 1576, none is really an explicit, individual declaration of Catholic faith in a personal turn of phrase. A dozen contain the bare traditional structure or parts of it. Yet the wills of one or two priests (e.g. Richard Salvin, the deprived incumbent of Hinderwell) whom we know from other sources to have been Catholic-minded contain almost none of that structure. In October 1560 the ex-Franciscan curate of St John's Richmond, William Loftus, uses the traditional preamble and bequeathes a cloth of red say and roses with the image of St Lawrence on it to the high altar—which, pretty certainly, was in process of being removed. In November 1558, seven months after the Acts of the Elizabethan settlement, John Byrmand, curate of Cundall, left a red chasuble to his church and money to buy a chalice and paten. In 1561 Thomas Barnes, a parson of Sessay, left a cope of green damask to the church of Wetherall (no doubt his birthplace) and asks his priest friends to pray for his soul. In 1565 Edmund Skelton, curate of Egton, left to his successor 'a boke called postella cassiodorius catholicon and a byble in lattyn to remaine in the churche for ever'. In 1567, in an otherwise doctrinally non-committal will, George Nevill, D.D., master of the hospital of Well and friend of the two Catholic 'archpriests', Drs Carter and Sedgwick, left to the church of Well 'bokes called the course of Lyra'. In 1575 Reginald Hyndmers, parson of Wensley, family friend and steward of the Scrope family, started his will with the full traditional preamble and then struck it out. Alongside priests' wills are those of the laity which make significant references to clergy. So, for instance, in August 1559 (proved at Richmond in November 1560) Francis Catterick, gent., of Stanwick St John left 'to Sir Steven Lechfelde xx nobles and yf the churche cum to the olde state xx markes'. In April and November 1559 husbandmen at Egton and Whorlton ask their parsons—who are witnesses—to pray for their souls ('. . . to Sir Edward Saunder my goostlye father to praye for me . . .'). In July 1559 Richard Perkyson, husbandman of Stainton left to his parish church

(with the parson as witness) 'a paire of sensers'. In April 1560 an Easingwold parishioner asks his parson to pray for his soul. In 1566 Mrs Jane Fulthorp of Hipswell, in a very conservative will, leaves two rosaries and bequests to Sir William Wright the curate who has a chamber in her house. The clearly Catholic will of Christopher Bowes of Angram Grange in 1568 has the parson of Welbury as witness; the same year an Easington yeoman asks his parson to pray for his soul.

Again, it is evident that the clergy must quite often have written the laity's wills. Explicit references to this are very few—e.g. the Catholic-phrased will of John Norton, gent., of Acklam in Cleveland in 1570, who leaves a bequest to 'Sir Christopher Watson vicar of Marton for his paines in writinge this wyll'. But quite often the uniformity of odd turns of phrase in wills made in single parishes over a decade betrays a single mind, and we there also quite commonly find the same cleric repeatedly mentioned as a witness. A survey of the incidence of the traditional preamble in the wills of the laity therefore ought also to give us a very rough indication of the prevalence of conservative habits of mind amongst the clergy. It is not surprising to find that in 1559–60 some three-quarters of the surviving North Riding wills have the old preamble—with a predominance in Cleveland and Richmondshire. In those areas the practice lasted quite strongly to the early 1570's and then died out fast. Elsewhere in the Riding it collapsed between 1563 and 1567.⁽⁴⁶⁾

We should therefore summarise our impressions of the parochial clergy of this period as follows: between 1559 and 1565 a very considerable majority of them in the North Riding were, at any rate in habit, conservative-minded. Then the pressure of events (the 1559 visitation, the 1569 rising, the assault on monuments of superstition) together with the influence of men like Morton, Allen, Drs Sedgwick and Carter, and the tonic effect of the religious confusion of the times forced the more determined characters into definite conservative action. Thus out of the ruck of the passively conservative appeared twelve to fifteen who faced deprivation and hardships, and another fifty to fifty-three who momentarily courted trouble and

then fell back into conformism. Relative to the size of its population, the North Riding equalled the other Ridings in the number of the deprived; but it fell surprisingly short of the West Riding's eighty-seven (East Riding forty-six) in numbers of momentarily active conservative conformists; and the High Commission never uncovered in the North Riding anything so remarkable as the crop of Catholic liturgical survivals found in the mid-1560's in Holderness and Howdenshire. All of this does no more than illustrate, and confirm the accuracy of, the judgments of such diverse contemporaries as William Allen, Archbishop Young, the Earl of Rutland and Sir Thomas Gargrave. They agreed that Protestantism in Yorkshire in the 1560's was 'stayed' from advancing by the passive prejudices and fixed mental attitudes of the clergy in general, but that explicitly and determinedly Catholic clergy were very few. (Gargrave added the interesting comment that Protestantism had been more 'forward' in Yorkshire in Edward VI's reign than it was in the 1560's.)⁽⁴⁷⁾

Although 1568 saw the opening of the first English seminary abroad, at Douai, by 1582 very few Continentally-trained English mission priests had reached the North Riding. Contacts between the Riding and the English Catholic exiles abroad after 1559 seem always to have existed. Scarborough was in regular trading contact with Flanders—we have already noticed a Scarborough shipmaster caught importing vestments and rosaries in 1583. In 1585 a sizeable shipment of 500 Catholic catechisms, fifteen Latin New Testaments, thirty Primers and forty-five Meditation books, bound for Scarborough, was intercepted en route.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Also there was a longstanding custom of sending boys to Flanders or Paris for their education—in 1562 a son of Mr Harrington of York and Mount St John, Thirsk, was sharing chambers in Paris with one Tessimond of York. The government's agents abroad that year noted that the suspect Catholic Earl of Lennox and his wife had many such easy contacts with the Continent. The abortive efforts of Thomas Bell to get overseas by London might have stood a better chance by Scarborough or Whitby. In 1562-4, the Riding came in contact with the Catholic authorities abroad through Allen's visit, and again in 1569 through Dr Morton—

who both passed to the very centres of the English Catholic exile mission movement at Douai and Rome. Then in 1569 a small contingent of North Riding Catholic rebels fled abroad to Flanders—the Nortons, John and Ingram Thwing of Over Helmsley, Robert Heighington and John Gower of Richmond, Leonard Metcalfe of Aysgarth and an unidentified 'Mr Rokeby'. In 1571 they were followed by Dr Carter and in 1575 by Dr Marshall, both of whom went to Douai. Thus links between the Riding, Douai and Rome were firmly established.⁽⁴⁹⁾

That last statement is not simply an expression of narrow local sentiment. In its early years especially, the English College at Douai had a very strong northern contingent—in which Yorkshiremen predominated—in both staff and students. We can detect traces of a definite system of communications between Yorkshire and Douai for the passage of men, boys, letters and money collected from Catholics for the upkeep of the College. Several men passed regularly backwards and forwards on this route, combining their work with that of messengers between the exiles of 1569 and their families at home or of commercial representatives of businesses in Leeds and Sheffield. By the end of 1582 we can identify twenty of the Douai students as having come from the North Riding and one other who had gone straight to Rome. Of these, ten had been ordained and left for the English mission. The first to come to England was Martin Nelson. In the villages ranging out into the Riding from the northern suburbs of York, Heworth, Overton, Huntington, Gate Helmsley, was a group of gentry families connected with official life in York. The Nelsons had, a generation earlier, provided two Lord Mayors of York, and were intermarried with the Beseleys, who eventually acquired the manor of Overton from them by marriage in 1573. The two main figures in the Beseley family were Raynold Beseley (died in 1562–3) an advocate in the York ecclesiastical courts, and his cousin and son-in-law Edward Beseley, who was solicitor for the city of York and clerk to the Castle in 1558–9. The Beseleys, in their turn, were related to the Standevens, aldermen and advocates of York. At Huntington were the Homes, the Fosters—John Foster was a coroner—and the Agars

York advocates. At Heworth and Gate Helmsley were the Thwings. All of these families were early recusants and from them, amongst the first generation at Douai, came Martin Nelson and his brothers, John and Thomas, Seth Foster, William Thwing. The latter's father, John Thwing of Gate Helmsley, was married to a Grimston relation of Cardinal Allen, and acted as a courier between the exiles in Flanders, Douai and Yorkshire.

Martin Nelson graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1569, appeared as a theological student (presumably from studies elsewhere, probably at Louvain) at Douai in 1574 and was ordained priest the same year. He left for England in 1574 or 1575, returned briefly in the spring of 1576 to escort three unnamed students, and went back to the mission. As we shall see later, he seems to have remained on the Yorkshire mission until at least 1600. He was followed to England, in 1576, by Lancelot Blackburne, late schoolmaster of Topcliffe, who had arrived at Douai in 1571 with Dr Carter. He was in gaol in December 1576—we do not know where—but at liberty by March 1577. There is every likelihood—but no certainty—that he gravitated to his home country. The third missionary was John Nelson, Martin's brother, ordained and sent out to England in July 1577. But he does not seem to have got further north than London, where he was arrested and martyred in February 1578.⁽⁵⁰⁾ The fourth was Luke Kirby. (There is some confusion in the sources about his birthplace, some giving county Durham, others Richmondshire.) He was a university graduate and reconciled to the Church at Louvain. Ordained in 1577, he set out for England in May 1578, but was back at Douai six weeks later and went thence to Rome on a pilgrimage. In 1580 he formed part of the escort of Campion and Persons from Rome to Douai, but left for England after them in June 1580. It is pretty certain that he did not go north of London, where he was arrested that December and martyred in 1582. It is therefore very unlikely that he ever appeared in Yorkshire as a priest; if he did so, it was at the most for a few weeks. The fifth missionary was Richard Holtby of Fryton, Hovingham. He was the son of Lancelot Holtby, gentleman, of Fryton, was educated at Northallerton school, went to Christ's

College, Cambridge, in 1571 (no doubt on the proceeds of the half-share of the manor of Hovingham bequeathed to him by his father in 1561), passed on to Caius in 1573 and then to Hart Hall, Oxford. He undoubtedly owed his reconciliation to the Church to university influences and not to his family—for whose conversion he was later responsible. He was ordained at Douai and left for the mission in February 1579. There is little doubt that he was at work in Allertonshire and the north of the Riding by mid-1580, and, as we shall see, he made the arrangements for Campion's famous visit there.

The sixth missionary was Edward Rishton, who very probably came from Richmondshire. He was a graduate of Brasenose College, Oxford, ordained at Douai in 1577, passed to Rome and accompanied Campion and Persons to Douai in 1580. He formed part of their mission to England and was apparently reported to be in the neighbourhood of York that same year. However it is more likely that he stayed in the south, since he certainly was arrested there in December 1580, and remained in gaol there until he was deported to the Continent in 1585, where he soon died at Douai.⁽⁵¹⁾ The seventh missionary was John Gower. He was a younger son of Ralph Gower, a chief Burgess of Richmond, and possibly lived at Easby, where his father had acquired monastic property. His uncle was the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Christopher Wray. John Gower had fled abroad after taking part in the 1569 rising. In 1571 he was reported to be with the rest of the exiles in Flanders. The following year he seems to have visited Richmond secretly. Sometime after his return to Flanders he was admitted to Douai, and was sent thence to the English College, Rome, in 1576. There he spent four years, and acted with considerable spirit as one of the leaders of a revolt of the English students against the Welsh party. In 1580 he was ordained, taking the mission oath, and left for England. In fact it seems pretty certain that he never saw England again. In 1582 he was in prison in Paris. It seems that on reaching Paris he had had serious doubts about his religion and had communicated with his friends and relations in England. His uncle, the Chief Justice—who had recently presided over the trial of Campion (but whom Allen

regarded as secretly well-disposed towards Catholicism)—had obtained a royal pardon for him and letters of grace for a safe return to England. George Grimston of Little Smeaton, a clerical student and relation of Allen's, passing through Paris, had met Gower, discovered his state of mind and alerted English priests there and Allen in Rome. Gower was arrested by the Paris ecclesiastical authorities as suspect of heresy. Both Allen and the English Ambassador in Paris were certain that he was on the verge of turning Protestant, and the English government made diplomatic representations to get his release. The Douai college authorities seem, at any rate for a year, to have got the French to continue to hold Gower at the college's expense. By this time his mind was still unknown and he forwarded to Allen a document which the latter thought more an apologia than a profession of faith. He is next met with staying at the English College, Rome, in September 1585 and again in 1588 and then we finally lose sight of him.⁽⁵²⁾

The last three missionaries of this period were Thomas Bell, Samuel Conyers and Thomas Nelson, who all left Douai as priests for England in the middle, or later part, of 1582. Bell we have already met at Thirsk and in York Castle. He arrived at Douai in February 1576 and was sent on to the English College, Rome where he played a minor part on the English students' side in the disputes there, was ordained in 1582 and passed through Douai on his way to England. Samuel Conyers—who may have been one of the Conyers family of Hutton Bonville and so a relation of Allen—left Douai as a priest late in November 1582. It is uncertain whether he worked for a year or two in England, passed abroad and was caught landing in the south early in 1585, or whether he only reached this country for the first time in 1585. In any case, he was soon deported abroad from gaol and died at Douai in 1587. Thomas Nelson, another brother of Martin Nelson, also only reached England in the latter part of 1582. As we shall see later, there seems to be overwhelming evidence that seminary priests, from the 1570's to the later seventeenth century, were normally very peripatetic in England. It is therefore quite likely that missionaries who were natives of other parts

of Yorkshire or other counties did periods of work in the North Riding from the earliest days of the seminary mission. But by the end of 1582 there were very few seminary priests in any part of Yorkshire—indeed, anywhere in the country. When the great High Commission drive against recusants came in August-September 1580, North Riding Catholics could only have had three local seminary priests at work amongst them, and the situation was no better in the East and West Ridings. We can identify one ‘alien’ seminary priest who may well have worked in the North Riding by then. This was William (or John) Wattes, a Welshman, who left Douai as a priest for England in August 1578. In August 1579 he was arrested in Yorkshire, as he was escorting four Catholics (one of them a boy of thirteen, Robert Tempest) out of Lincolnshire. He escaped from prison in York promptly and reached Douai in January 1580, only to leave again for England in April. A few months later he was despatched by Fr Persons on a secret mission to Scotland, and later returned to report on this and on his observations during a ten-month tour of what Fr Persons calls vaguely the four or five counties nearest to the Scottish border.⁽⁵³⁾

The first Jesuit mission to the North Riding was apparently the fruit of Fr Persons’ view that it was then vital to concentrate mission activity on three important neglected fields—Wales, Cambridgeshire and the northern counties. Therefore after the ‘council’ held at Southwark in June 1580 by the members of the Persons-Campion mission recently landed in England, Edmund Campion, S.J., set out in January 1581 for the north. It has been suggested that Richard Holtby arranged his stopping-places, and that is quite likely. Unfortunately only one of these stopping-places—Mount St John in Felixkirk, the house of William Harrington—is identifiable with certainty. Ironically, the house (on the site of a commandery of the Hospitallers) was leased by the Harringtons of the Archbishop of York, and Felixkirk in some way formed a member of the Archbishop’s Liberty of Ripon. No doubt choice of the house for Campion was helped by the fact that, though secluded, it was not far from Thirsk and the main roads; more important, perhaps, was the fact that it

formed an island of the West Riding in the midst of the North Riding. Twenty years later the North Riding Justices seem to have been receiving presentments from the parish, but it is possible that, in 1581, recusants there had some chance of being overlooked. The Harrington family belonged to the same class as the Nelsons—the well-to-do professional and merchant class of York. They were related to the Cowlings of York who already had two or three sons at Douai, and to the Fawkes family, registrars and attorneys in the York ecclesiastical courts—whence, fairly certainly, came Guy Fawkes. It must also have been an advantage to Campion that the Harringtons had not come under suspicion for religion since 1562. He stayed in their house twelve days and—according to Simpson—redrafted his ‘Decem Rationes’ there. The York authorities in the 1590’s seem to have accepted the idea that he founded recusancy in the whole Birdforth-Allertonshire-Cleveland area. It is true that he made a deep and lasting impression on his host’s son, William, who defended his memory before his own judges in 1594. There is also an intercepted Catholic letter of 1582–3 which may very likely contain a memory of a journey by Campion to or from Mount St John. The writer asks that the vicar of Helmsley (who was vicar of Darlington in 1581) may be reminded that ‘I could wish him to perform that which he promised the man of the mount and me betwixt Allerton and Bedale and by so doing he may receive such commodity and comfort as he cannot nor doth not think . . .’. Apart from this it is hard to discover any tangible results of the visit. It coincided with the tail-end of the Earl of Huntingdon’s first great drive against recusants, which had begun in August 1580 when Campion was still in the south. Relatively few recusants had been unearthed in the country round Mount St John, and they had almost all gone through the gestures of conformity by the time Campion reached the area.⁽⁵⁴⁾

The other gentry who were arrested on charges of housing him were Thomas Grimston, John Rokeby and (apparently) Asculph Cleasby. Grimston was entered in the London Council’s minutes as of Grimston Garth in the East Riding—which was certainly his main house. But he also owned property in Mitton parish,

just over the West Riding border into Lancashire, and at Little Smeaton in Birkby parish, Allertonshire, and had been presented for recusancy, with his son and a schoolmaster, at Smeaton in 1575-6. William Hawksworth was arrested at this time—though it is not certain that the charge was for receiving *Campion*. He also owned property in Birkby parish, in Mitton and elsewhere in the West Riding; and the Grimston and Hawksworth families had sons at Douai and were closely related to Allen. We have already noticed the evidence that Allen himself had stayed in Birkby parish in 1562-4. It is therefore quite probable that *Campion* stayed at Little Smeaton. John Rokeby was the heir to Mortham Tower, Rokeby in Richmondshire. The Council and the London gaolers gave his address as 'Danby' in Yorkshire, and it is evident that this was Little Danby by Yafforth in the parish of Danby Wiske in Richmondshire, where John had recently been presented for recusancy. The information of the government on *Campion's* hosts gave Asculph Cleasby as of Yafforth. In fact Cleasby seems to have been an agent of Lord Conyers' family. He had been a rebel in 1569 and his connection with the Darcys had secured him a pardon. His principal estate was at Cleasby in Gilling East wapentake, but he also had Morton in Ormesby and Newton, both in Cleveland, in 1581 and was living at Morton at his death in 1584; he held it as a farm of the Darcy family of Hornby. The Council does not seem to have pursued the accusation against Cleasby—perhaps he was already moribund, or, more likely, *Campion* stayed at Little Danby with Rokeby (who was put in gaol in London for some years) and informers confused his house with that of Cleasby nearby at Yafforth.⁽⁵⁵⁾

Informations to the government suggested that *Campion* had visited other Yorkshire houses—of Mrs Bulmer (either at Thirsdale in county Durham or Marrick in Richmondshire), Dr Vavasour of York and Sir William Babthorpe of Osgodby in the East Riding. But it seems that evidence was lacking and they do not seem to have been prosecuted. Why then did *Campion's* stay in Yorkshire differ so markedly from his travels in Lancashire and Derbyshire—where he moved around a good deal and visited a quite considerable number of houses? We can only suggest that

the reason was the coincidence of the visit with Huntingdon's drive. In the long run, perhaps the real result of Campion's stay was the founding of a permanent Jesuit-directed and well-organised Yorkshire mission by Richard Holtby and John Mush after January 1591. Holtby left Yorkshire for Flanders in 1583 to become a Jesuit. In September 1581 there arrived at Douai on a visit 'D. Warcopp'. It is tempting to identify this with Thomas Warcopp gentleman of Gatenby, who was later to be an important lay helper of Holtby's Jesuit mission.

The fourth main feature of the years 1559-82 was the fact that the religious state of the laity corresponded to that of their clergy. Religious conservatism was very prevalent, but outright Catholic nonconformity was relatively rare.

In trying to interpret the court book evidence for this we need to know the realities of the contemporary social background in the Riding. Towns were few and rustic, and an overwhelmingly agrarian society was dominated by its landowners. By far the greatest landowners were the Crown and the Church. The Crown at this period had an immense and impressive concentration of land in the Riding. Its core consisted of the Duchy of Lancaster, honour of Pickering, the Crown honours of Richmond and Middleham and the forest of Galtres. In addition to this, the Crown had acquired between 1536 and 1540 the huge mass of monastic property, and, contrary to popular belief, in 1559-82 still retained ownership of the great majority of it. In practice, however, the Crown's influence in the Riding as a landlord was, in relation to the size of its estates, astonishingly small. In spite of Thomas Cromwell's efforts, there was no central overall estate administration, and the actual administration was a strange and most complicated jumble, complicated at Westminster (where the Exchequer and several other government departments shared interests in the lands) and complicated in the Riding, where administration was farmed out to a large and heterogeneous collection of stewards, bailiffs, collectors, foresters, castellans, lessees. In practice therefore most of the direct influence of the landowner over the tenants was appropriated to themselves by local nobility and gentry holding these offices or leases, while the

Crown's main surviving power lay in its power of appointment to them. Also the Crown's financial needs—and the strong urgings of speculators and the land-hungry, which a very indifferently-organised, underpaid and corrupt bureaucracy found it hard to resist—led to massive sales of Crown lands (mainly ex-monastic), particularly after 1580.

The Church's estate administration was equally complicated, inefficient and even more incapable of bringing to bear on society the full weight which one would have imagined so great a land-owner ought to have exercised. The Archbishop of York owned thirteen properties in the Riding, the Bishop of Durham Crayke and four manors in his liberty of Allertonshire (Northallerton, Osmotherley, Leake, part of South Otterington), the Dean of Windsor two manors in Pickering Lythe; there were nine prebendal manors and then the great mass of rectories and tithes. In fact almost all this property was leased to local gentry, and, like Crown leases, the terms were normally a long lease, small rent and high entry fine. It is a common experience, when working on gentry family papers, to realise with surprise that manors which appear in the accounts for generations were actually farmed Church property. Thus a rising gentry family could rely heavily for quick profits on stewardships or leases of Crown lands, leases of rectories and tithes.

Landowning influence in the Riding therefore was heavily in the hands of nobility and gentry. Whereas the West and East Ridings had few landowning peers of considerable property there, the North Riding had no less than twelve at this period (excluding several others who owned no more than small parcels of land and whose influence was of no account in the Riding). Of these twelve, four (three of them normally resident in the Riding) were very large landowners. Of the eight lesser landowning peers, one resided constantly in the Riding and the others were usually represented by resident relations and themselves made occasional visitations. The great landowners were the Earl of Northumberland and Lords Dacre, Conyers of Hornby and Scrope of Bolton. Thomas Percy, first Earl of Northumberland of the new (Marian) creation, had a total rent-roll of over £4,000. Although we

normally think of the Percies as a Northumbrian family, in fact their fortunes had always centred on their Yorkshire estates which then produced nearly half of their income. The Earl had large estates in Northumberland, Cumberland, Sussex and Wales, but he very rarely even visited Alnwick—which was then in disrepair—and only occasionally stayed at his houses of Wressle and Leconfield in the East Riding, Spofforth in the West, preferring to reside at Topcliffe. Besides the great estate at Topcliffe and its members, he owned Kildale, Kirk Levington, Battersby in Cleveland, and Killerby in Pickering Lythe. It is likely that a good deal of his income in those areas came from rectories and tithes. In Richmondshire he seems to have had no estates of his own, but had great influence as royal steward of the honours of Richmond and Middleham. Thomas Dacre, Lord Dacre of Gillesland, lived normally in Cumberland, but was represented in the North Riding by his brother, Leonard Dacre. His properties were widely dispersed—in Cleveland (Seamer, Aislaby, Middleton on Leaven, Throxenby in Scalby), in Bulmer (Bulmer, Hinderskelf, Ganthorpe, Welbury), in Birdforth and Allertonshire (East Harlsey—where Leonard Dacre lived—West Harlsey, Thornton-le-Moor) and Ainderby Steeple in Richmondshire. Here again—and in the cases of all these peers—his rent-roll must have been swelled by the proceeds of farmed rectories and tithes.⁽⁵⁶⁾ John Conyers, Lord Conyers of Hornby, lived at Hornby Castle in Richmondshire and the bulk of his large estates was concentrated round there, with important manors in Cleveland (Yarm, Marske, Skelton, Brotton), in Allertonshire (North Otterington, Hutton Bonville) and at Alne in Bulmer. Henry Scrope, Lord Scrope of Bolton, living at Bolton Castle, was the largest landowning subject in Richmondshire and had only one other estate of his own elsewhere in the Riding, at Dishforth near Topcliffe.

John Neville, Lord Latimer, was the one constant resident amongst the lesser landowning peers. He owned Snape (his home) and Well in Richmondshire, Danby and Glaisdale in Cleveland, Sinnington and Thornton-le-Dale in Pickering Lythe. Thomas Wharton, Lord Wharton, had estates scattered between Essex

and Westmorland, but he now lived at Healaugh in the Ainsty of York. He had a large but unproductive estate in Richmondshire round Reeth and Muker, and had sold his holding in Cleveland in 1560. William Eure, Lord Eure, who was normally then on official business on the Marches, had a home at Ingleby Greenhow. His North Riding properties were in two blocks—one in Cleveland, at Stokesley, Ingleby Greenhow, Kirkby in Cleveland, Little Ayton, the other his lordship of Malton with outlying members, including Dalby in Bulmer. Charles Neville, Earl of Westmorland, who seems to have preferred Brancepeth in Durham as a home, also had two blocks of North Riding property—one centring on Kirkby Moorside, bolstered by rectories, and stretching over the surrounding moors, the other centring on Great Ayton in Cleveland. His brother, Christopher Neville, resided at Kirkby. The Scots Stuart Earl of Lennox from Settrington (East Riding wolds) and Temple Newsam (Leeds) controlled a considerable but scattered mass of ex-monastic lands in the North Riding, mostly in Richmondshire. John Lumley, Lord Lumley (from county Durham or Sussex) owned two properties (Kirkleatham and Great Moresholm) in Cleveland. Finally, two very powerful 'alien' peers owned each one single large nucleated lordship in the Riding—the Earl of Derby Thirsk, and the Earl of Rutland Helmsley (where his brother resided).⁽⁵⁷⁾

But to what extent did these peers really exercise a powerful influence in the Riding? It has often been maintained that they represented a 'feudal twilight', survivals of the middle ages, hence economically, socially, politically and in religion unprogressive and doomed to extinction. But surely that is an exaggerated view. It is true that in fact the great majority of the twelve peerages of 1559 vanished from the Riding by 1660; Westmorland by attainder in 1569–70, Dacre to heiresses in 1569, Conyers to heiresses in 1567, Latimer to heiresses in 1577, Lennox and Lumley to heiresses by the early seventeenth century, Scrope to heiresses in 1630; Rutland lost Helmsley in the mid-seventeenth century and the Eures were in financial straits and full decline. In 1559–69, of the peers most engaged in the Riding, Northumberland, Westmorland and Dacre were in

political eclipse, which was certainly connected with their known religious conservatism. They were also apparently in some financial difficulties, to judge from the comments of the commissioners who surveyed their estates in 1570. Matthew Stuart, Earl of Lennox and his wife were an intermittent cause of considerable alarm to the government between 1561 and 1564 and both were at one time imprisoned in London. They were regarded as the centre of a Catholic plot, with Northumberland, Westmorland and all those most 'unsound in religion' in the North and East Ridings. The second Lord Wharton was also regarded with suspicion. He was briefly gaoled in London in 1561 for hearing Mass. Edward Stanley, third Earl of Derby, had been a strong supporter of the Marian régime, and was now held to be a definite 'misliker of religion'. Lord Dacre was regarded as a definite protector of papists in 1561 and 1564. Lord Lumley was closely associated with his relation, Lord Arundel, and was imprisoned in the Tower from September 1569 to 1573 as a Catholic plotter. We know nothing of Lord Conyers' religion, but in 1569 his agent, Asculph Cleasby, was a very active rebel, and members of the Conyers family were recusants by the 1580's. Northumberland, in 1572, maintained that the northern peerage as a whole had sympathised with the aims of his rising. Almost all had been prominent in the service of Queen Mary. As for their large and elaborate households, extensive connections with gentry families devoted to their service, and very widespread 'pull' on the Yorkshire gentry at large, there is enough evidence in their and the gentry's wills, surviving accounts of estates of the peers, and the now famous excited generalisations of government servants like Bowes, Hunsdon and Sadler during the 1569 rising.⁽⁵⁸⁾

But this picture of a conservative, 'feudal' old world needs to be corrected by adding several other features which are not so familiar. In the first place, the categories of 'feudal' and 'modern' are not very helpful when looking at sixteenth-century Yorkshire society; the changeover from one form of rural society to the other *has* taken place, but the change was immensely gradual. It began in the twelfth century; it was not accomplished until quite

recent times. On the one hand, the preponderance of noble great landowners in Yorkshire lasted until recently (as we shall see, Lords Fauconberg and Darcy ran North Riding administration from their estate offices in the later seventeenth century; the Marquess of Rockingham and the Earl of Carlisle ran it in the eighteenth century from Malton and Castle Howard); large and elaborate households and trains of client gentry and tenantry (even in arms) existed at the times of the Civil Wars and Napoleonic Wars; religious and social conservatism and a mixture of lavish expenditure and shortage of ready money long remained features of noble families. On the other hand, modernity affected the peerage long before 1559. Their franchise jurisdictions, always royal, had long ceased to be their own peculiar possessions; they had long depended on a multiplicity of offices from the Crown—Wardenships of the Marches, stewardships of royal liberties, membership of commissions and Councils—and on the farm of Church lands, to make their way of life and influence possible. Hence their attitude towards the government had long been one which wavered delicately between obedience and creating trouble to draw attention to their being pushed out of their rightful share of honours by others. The government's attitude to them equally had long wavered between grateful use of them and periodical cold-shouldering for fear they would gain too much local control. No sooner were the numbers of great peers much reduced by 1570 and Elizabeth launched on an apparently consistent policy of restricting new creations, than her councillor, Hunsdon, urged how necessary great peer landowners were to the government.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Again, the peers were now modern in their religious outlook—or rather there was a modernity alongside their basic conservatism. Thus Lennox's religious career is a great mixture of motives and hesitations; Northumberland, whatever the Archbishop of York judged to be his obstinate Catholicism in 1564, was originally a conformist, and he was only reconciled in 1567 after much reading of the books of Sander, Harding and Stapleton. We seem to know nothing by direct report of Westmorland's religion, beyond the fact that he subscribed with Northumberland to the

proclamation of 1569 declaring that the aims of the rebellion were twofold—to restore the Catholic religion (Northumberland added the rider—or to procure liberty of conscience at least) and overthrow an attempt by certain of the Queen's advisers to 'procure the destruction of the nobility'. It seems clear that Westmorland had been reconciled also in about 1567. Also he can hardly have been brought up in a determinedly Catholic household. His father, the fifth Earl, had been a pillar of the Marian government, but in 1561, when called to account for a third marriage to his deceased wife's sister, he had written to Cecil hopefully that the 'liberty of the gospel' now established should make such a marriage possible, and that he did not want 'the usurped jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome in this realm' ever to be restored. It is possible that these were only arguments *ad hominem*, since, when the fifth Earl died in 1563, he left a legacy to Robert Dalton, B.D., clerk—apparently the deprived Durham prebendary whose religious position we have already discussed—who witnessed the will. The will had no overtly Catholic features. Thus both Earls had, with difficulty, emerged from merely passive religious conservatism to make positive choices—but emerged into a complex situation where political motives and real doubts about the morality of Catholic rebellion bedevilled their desire for action on their faith. Leonard Dacre may well have been reconciled by 1569, though we have no certainty about this. Before and during the rising his behaviour betrayed a great tangle of mixed motives and hesitations. At first he was the most violent for a rising; he then deserted the Earls and went to make his peace at court, went to Naworth and assisted Scrope to harry the retreating rebels, and finally broke into futile rebellion himself alone, mainly in a desperate effort to seize the whole Dacre inheritance which was passing from him by law. Lord Wharton, while being privy to the keeping of a Marian priest in his house at Healaugh, and himself leaving a Catholic will, remained otherwise a purely passive 'misliker' of established religion. He gave the rebel Earls no overt sign of support and was actually in arms with the Queen's forces in the north-west. Lord Lumley, though in the Tower as a suspected

Catholic plotter from 1569 to 1573, emerged to act as a royal Commissioner for the trial of Mary, Queen of Scots and never showed himself as a recusant during the rest of his long life. Lord Latimer's religion remains an enigma. In 1563 he and eleven of his 'concubines' were summoned to the York High Commission to answer charges of blatant immorality. On the other hand we may well include him amongst the religious conservatives on two counts. Northumberland claimed in 1572 that the northern peers as a body were sympathetic to his cause. Also there were quite large numbers of men from Latimer estates amongst the rebels—twenty-three from Well and twenty from Snape where Latimer was living (yet Bowes reported that Latimer was taken prisoner by the rebels and his houses spoiled). The inscription on his wife's tomb is very theologically Protestant—but one of his daughters was the wife of Sir Thomas Cornwallis of Suffolk, a sincere if puzzled Catholic, and another the wife of Cecil's eldest son. Two other peers, Scrope and Eure, throughout this period gave every appearance of being convinced Protestants. Scrope was chosen to be the gaoler of Mary, Queen of Scots, at Bolton Castle from July 1568 to February 1569, and served actively against the rebels. Eure also served against the rebels and was accounted a Protestant by Gargrave in 1572.⁽⁶⁰⁾

A last sign of modernity in the peers was the fact that their following in 1569 was hardly their own feudal retinue. It is true that Northumberland and Westmorland were followed by a retinue of their household officers, serving men and tenants. The terms used of them by Sir George Bowes, and Cardinal Allen's description of Ingram Thwing as a man bred from boyhood in Northumberland's service and so following him 'to the holy war for religion' and to exile, all imply a bond of duty extending to service in arms. But the basis of this was not really feudal in any legal sense, and the keeping of large retinues by greater landowners lasted for centuries after 1569. Also the immediate clientele of the rebel lords seems to have been a limited thing in two ways. It was limited in the sense that, to a marked degree, they all seem to have drawn jointly on the

services of a limited group of gentry. So, for instance, the Cholmleys of Roxby were closely related to Westmorland and Robert Cholmley was his personal gentleman, but Roger Cholmley was in the service of Lennox, Benet Cholmley was a tenant and supporter of the Dacres, and Sir Richard Cholmley's son-in-law, Marmaduke Readman, was a servant of Northumberland. Peter Vavasour was solicitor to the estates of both Lennox and Northumberland and probably other peers also. The Constables of Halsham also belonged to this set of families. The peers' clientele was also limited in that it formed no more than a minority nucleus of the rebel army. With it went groups of gentry who were simply personal friends or relations of (or, no doubt, sympathisers with) the Earls. The Nortons and Markenfields, Lamberts, Cattericks and a good many others belonged to this group. Also with these groups, more numerous than they were, came the ordinary musters of Richmondshire and Cleveland, called out through their head constables and parish constables by writs in the Queen's name. At any rate in Richmondshire Northumberland was here making use of his royal commission as steward of the honour. There are two interesting comments on this force—both, no doubt, to be used only with allowances for the circumstances in which they were made. The first was Northumberland's admission in 1572 that, at one point, before the rising, he blenched at the ramshackle nature of such an army and was tempted to base the rising instead on the fixed military service of his Border tenantry. The second is the statement of the bailiffs of Richmond some ten years later that the situation there was then more dangerous than it had been in 1569.⁽⁶¹⁾

When we pass from the peers to the gentry of the North Riding, we find the same forces of conservatism and modernity at work. It is not easy to calculate how many gentry families there were. The Heralds, in their visitation of Yorkshire in 1584 summoned no less than 698 'reputed to be gentlemen' to appear and enter their pedigrees; 339 from the West Riding, 142 from the East and 217 from the North. About the same time, Sir William Fairfax of Gilling compiled his 'Book of Arms' as a

guide to the men who painted the great frieze (still there) of Yorkshire gentry, wapentake by wapentake, round the walls of his new Great Chamber. He counted 463 gentry—196 in the West Riding, ninety-four in the East and 173 in the North. A modern authority has calculated—counting only armigerous gentry—that there were 679 in 1642, of whom 195 lived in the North Riding.⁽⁶²⁾ They formed a very variegated class. At the top were families which, in terms of wealth, were almost the equals of the lesser peers, and who, in any reign but Queen Elizabeth's, would have stood a fighting chance of securing peerages—now they only got knighthoods. In 1572 Sir Thomas Gargrave listed sixteen such families of whom at least eight owned property in the North Riding and five or six most often resided there. At the bottom of the scale of the gentry came 'mere gentry', who adopted the style but were not really armigerous, and a mass of poor younger sons living on annuities, farms or leases of tithes and rectories, or decayed gentry. But they had a common ambition and outlook, however diverse in wealth and standing. They cherished immensely their real (or supposed) gentle blood, wanted to guard it from dilution by 'plebeian' stock, and fought hard to keep, and, if possible, enlarge their estates and standing in the Riding. They used every available means—enclosures of waste and common, advantageous marriages with heiresses, stewardships or foresterships of Crown lands, leases of rectories and farms of tithes, offices of profit, service in war. Opportunities in the land market, such as were provided by the dissolution of the monasteries or the Crown's sales of property especially after 1580, drew them irresistibly. As they saw it, many acute dangers threatened their status—civil strife and its consequences, failing to produce male heirs (in days when the infant death-rate was very high), producing too many (who had to be provided for), having too many daughters (whose marriage portions could easily cripple an estate), making unprofitable marriages for their heirs, having dowagers who lived too long and denied their dowers too long to the heir. There was the danger of improvidence and extravagance, the expense of ill-disciplined hordes of servants, fraudulent stewards and trustees.

There was the threat of prolonged and unsuccessful litigation—in an age when constant litigation was part of the inevitable price paid for being a landowner. There was the now much increasing horror of leaving an heir a minor and falling into the hands of the Master of the Court of Wards—an ever-present threat for many even small squires, since ex-monastic property was subject to wardship. Above all this were the strong effects of a steady monetary inflation on a rather primitively organised rural society, putting premiums on profits and handicapping those who made no effort to improve their properties. Decaying or bankrupt gentry families or chronically unsuccessful members of one's own family underlined the moral to the dullest. Any prolonged study of the gentry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries leaves one with a strong impression of their toughness and resilience in the face of disasters. Perhaps, like the small intellectual and administrative class of the late Victorian period, the gentry of this period did, by their restricted system of intermarriage, breed a race adapted to the difficult job in hand. We also gain the impression that, so far from there being two distinct classes within the gentry—progressives and conservatives (and so, respectively, rising gentry and falling gentry)—the distinction cut across almost every gentry family. Over and over again one meets with the pushing and successful father of an improvident and debt-laden son, himself succeeded by a grandson who pushes desperately to restore the family fortunes. Debt and encumbrances on an estate were almost more powerful as incentives to economic action than inflation. All these factors inevitably produced in the gentry an intense preoccupation with economic advantages and disadvantages, which has tempted some historians to judge the age out of hand one incapable of high spiritual achievement or deep religious sincerity. As we shall try to suggest, this judgment seems altogether too summary.⁽⁶³⁾

The sixteenth century North Riding (and Yorkshire) gentry have left us nothing comparable to the amount of personal papers and estate accounts surviving from their seventeenth-century successors. Nevertheless we can get a fair picture of them and their estates and methods. The Cholmleys of Roxby and Whitby,

the Danbys of Farnley and Masham, the Fairfaxes of Walton and Gilling, the Nortons of Norton Conyers, Wath are random but fair examples of the knightly class. The Cholmleys settled in the Riding in the early part of the sixteenth century. Sir Roger (died 1538), the first settler, must have been an extremely pushing man of business. Starting with a small estate at Thornton-on-the-Hill acquired by marriage (in addition to Kent lands) he used all the usual methods to found an estate of so much consideration that he could marry his heir, Sir Richard of Roxby, Thornton-le-Dale, to a daughter of Lord Conyers, and a daughter to the Earl of Westmorland. Sir Richard, in early and middle life, surpassed his father, making full use of the opportunities provided by Crown grants of monastic properties. He acquired (at third-hand) the liberty of Whitby Strand and the bulk of the abbey demesnes in and around Whitby with Fylingdales; he bought several lucrative Rievaulx granges near Pickering and Grosmont Priory with its demesne in Egton. Other monastic properties (Basedale, Nunhouse, Oulston) he bought and resold—undoubtedly at a profit or means to greater acquisitions. Through marriages of his sons the family acquired Brandsby and Skewsby in Bulmer. He himself took, as his second wife, Catherine, daughter of the first Earl of Cumberland and widow of the eighth Lord Scrope of Bolton. He was in offices of profit from 1544 and in 1548 gained a life-grant of the castellanship of Scarborough with the castellan's demesne. But from the early 1560's, until his death in 1583, like the Riding's peers, he seems to have felt himself on the defensive, threatened on every side. His children's marriages were, by the standards of his own, insignificant; he became increasingly the defendant in litigation; he acquired almost a persecution complex directed against the Council of the North. He was accused of collusion with the Lennox group, was before the Westminster Council in 1565, full of bitter complaints of the Council of the North's favouritism and corruption, and was briefly imprisoned in York soon afterwards and undoubtedly endured one of those Tudor large fines which were compounded for a small payment. The Danbys were an even wealthier family. Sir Christopher (died 1518) of Thorpe

Perrow and Farnley, Leeds, married a Scrope and thereby acquired the great manor of Masham and a number of its members in 1517. His son, another Sir Christopher (died 1571), was a leader of the Pilgrimage of Grace, but went over to the Crown and sat on juries in the trials of the rebels. He had inherited large but very scattered estates, in the North Riding, West Riding, Kent, Suffolk and Lincolnshire. At the dissolution of the monasteries he seems to have attempted, by exchange of properties elsewhere, to consolidate his standing in the North Riding, but was unsuccessful. A number of monastic granges in and around Masham had been granted to Sir Thomas Gresham and Danby could not obtain them. Nevertheless, through his son's marriage with an heiress, the family gained Beeston in Leeds with important coalmines. He himself was married to a daughter of Lord Latimer. At the death of Henry VIII he was thought to have lost a real opportunity to link up with Paget's party and obtain a peerage. In fact he was quiescent throughout Edward VI's reign, and occupied no prominent position under Mary. After 1559 he was still preoccupied in trying to increase his estate, bought two small manors at Masham from Lord Scrope in 1565-6, and in 1571 bought Scruton (a Markenfield estate, lost by attainder in 1569 and granted to Sir George Bowes, the seller to Danby). But he was at odds with authority from at least 1565—when he was examined by the Council of the North on suspicion of treasonable practices, perhaps with the Lennox party, and remitted to the Privy Council—to his death in 1571.⁽⁶⁴⁾

The Fairfaxes of Walton were the senior of the three main branches into which that originally York and Ainsty family had divided by the early sixteenth century. The family's process of deliberate social climbing began early—was evident during their long struggle of 1460-92 to acquire the North Riding Gilling Castle estate. Sir Nicholas Fairfax (died 1571) was the first of the family to live in the Riding and an extremely able and ambitious man. By mole-like activity he quite trebled his estate and income, specialising in enclosure of commons and land speculation. His only misfortunes were three—a large family to provide for (twelve living children, eight of them sons), his failure to get in

properly on the monastic land market (he only acquired permanently the Whitby Abbey manor of Dunsley with its alum deposits, and that was needed to provide for younger sons), and his off-moments when, three times in his career, he was briefly at odds with authority—during the Pilgrimage of Grace, in 1561 over his clandestine second marriage, and in 1568 when he became too markedly intimate with the Earls. At his death he was prominent on the Council of the North, had often sat in Parliament, had married his heir to Lord Darcy's daughter, and had acquired the plum stewardship of royal property in the county—of the lands formerly of St Mary's Abbey, York. Sir William, his heir (died 1597), inherited the stewardship, and continued his father's steady activity of enclosure and land speculation. The Nortons of Norton Conyers in Richmondshire, if less wealthy, displayed the same characteristics. They early acquired the two Fountains granges of Baldersby (Topcliffe) and Melmerby (Wath). As we have already seen, most probably a member of the family was Clerk of the Peace for the Riding, and Richard Norton was sheriff of the county in 1569. He had eighteen living children and nine sons to provide for. In fact, although most of the males in the family were involved in the 1569 rising and the main estates lost by attainder, the family survived the disaster with remarkable—if rather slow—resilience, struck root elsewhere and long afterwards achieved a peerage.

The Meynell family seem to have been pretty representative of the middling gentry. They prided themselves on a perfectly genuine—if rather obscure—descent from a prominent noble medieval family in the Riding. Starting in the first decades of the sixteenth century with one small manor of Hilton, the family fortunes were refounded by Robert Meynell, Sergeant-at-Law (died 1563), a prominent York administrator in four Tudor reigns. With the profits of law and office he acquired the manors of Hawnby and Normanby as a basis for his own family, and helped his younger brother, Anthony, to buy piecemeal the manor of North Kilvington near Thirsk—where the Meynells had long ago gained a first foothold by leasing land from the canons of Egglestone and then buying the land after the dissolu-

tion of the monastery. By a well-documented process of co-operative family enterprise, Anthony, by his death in 1576, had patiently amassed two other estates in Richmondshire and consolidated his hold on Kilvington. His son, Roger Meynell (died 1591), imperilled the achievement by joining the 1569 rising, but the costs of extricating himself and the estate seem to have provided him with an incentive to further estate improvement. His own heir was very critical of his father's financial methods—raising money to buy new lands by borrowing and granting long, disadvantageous leases to tenants for high entry fines. But these were only 'crosses to the main chance', and Roger left the estate still further consolidated. The story of the Meynell estate repeats in miniature that of the far greater estates of people like the Danbys.⁽⁶⁵⁾

We must now set the available evidence of the gentry's religion on that very definite social and economic background. From 1561 to 1571 William Allen, Dr Morton, Sander, Sir Thomas Gargrave, the Earl of Rutland and Archbishops Young and Grindal agreed in their general judgment of the religious situation of the laity; a sense of uncertainty everywhere, periodical outbreaks of rumours and prognostications of great changes impending, many survivals of Catholic habits, and (as Grindal reported in 1571) 'the greatest part of our gentlemen are not well affected to godly religion'. There are plain hints, on both definite Protestant and definite Catholic sides, that this situation seemed to be producing fast a hard neutralism—as Grindal said, 'this seemeth to be as it were another church'. In 1568 Gargrave implied that outward conformity was normal and general, obstinate papist recusants very few indeed, but that neutralism was here and there beginning to produce a stage beyond passive or openly contemptuous church attendance—'some refuse communion and the church service is not used'. Detailed evidence bears out the accuracy of this. Definite Protestantism must have been very rare. Of its very nature and because of the contemporary background of Catholic habits, it must have been very much a personal and individual decision. Few families with a settled Protestant tradition of even two generations seem to have

existed. Although Gargrave in 1568 judged that Protestantism was less forward in Yorkshire than it had been in Edward VI's reign, the evidence of Edwardine Protestantism there is comparatively slight. There are three North Riding gentry families which produced early Protestants. Wilfrid Holme of Huntingdon (died 1538), the author of the explicitly Protestant verse, 'The Fall and Evil Success of Rebellion', did not, so far as we can judge, succeed in implanting his faith in his family. He left a child son and heir, Seth Holme, who was a papist recusant in 1577-80, and Catholicism remained in the family into the early decades of the seventeenth century.⁽⁶⁶⁾ Sir Thomas Gower of Stittenham, a master of ordnance, was implicated in Dudley's Protestant plot against Queen Mary and fled abroad. Almost inevitably—at this period—there was an economic background; he was heavily in debt. He made his peace with the Marian government in 1558 and returned to his ordnance. In 1564 Archbishop Young regarded him as a 'favourer of religion' and suitable for the commission of the Peace; in 1572 Gargrave endorsed that view, as did the Earl of Huntingdon in the year of Gower's death, 1577. Yet his parents, Sir Edward and Lady Gower of Stittenham, were returned that year as obstinate papist recusants and they outlived him. John Uvedale, secretary to the Council of the North in Edward VI's reign, was a definite Protestant, and Avery Uvedale of Marske in Richmondshire—most likely his son—a definitely Protestant Justice in the 1570's. Our list of known North Riding Protestant gentry by 1582 is short. We can be certain of Sir Henry Gate of Seamer (a newcomer, whose son later married a Catholic recusant in the East Riding), Sir George Bowes (really an immigrant from Durham), Ralph Bouchier of Benningbrough, William Pepper of Richmond, Roger Dalton, John Constable of Dromonby, Thomas Layton of Sexhow, Thomas Saville of Welburn, Robert Bainton, John Herbert, Thomas Davell of Coxwold. But nine others of the same class who were listed as Protestants at one time or another by the authorities were really doubtful cases. We shall meet them all again. There is reason to believe that after about 1575 Protestantism began to gain a deeper and wider hold, partly

through preachers introduced by Huntingdon and Grindal, partly through the influence of the universities. As we should expect, these were forcing houses of explicit opinions, Catholic and Protestant. A study of the register and papers of Caius College, Cambridge for the years 1576-85, not only shows that—as Cecil and Sandys complained—the college contained a strong, proselytising pro-Catholic group of tutors and undergraduates, but that an equally vigorous Protestant group had grown up alongside it. Indeed, the enthusiastic comments of the Archbishop's examining chaplains on young incumbents, recently down from the universities, in 1571 shows that the widening of the Protestant party had begun even earlier in the reign.⁽⁶⁷⁾

At the other end of the scale were the definite Catholic recusants. Before the 1569 rising the court books contain only two lay cases of this in the Riding—Christopher Lepton, Esq., of Over Silton in 1562, and John Cleasby, gent., of Cleasby in 1564. There is no sign that either was persistently obstinate. Behind them lay those noted as 'not favourers of religion', 'mislikers'. In August 1561 the Bishop of Durham, in virtue of a special royal commission, required the Justices of the North Riding to take the Oath of Supremacy. He reported that all took it willingly except three, Robert Meynell of Hawnby, Robert Lawson and Michael Wandesford of Kirklington. Meynell—who had been continuously on the Bench for twenty years and was a Sergeant-at-Law and Councillor of the North—took shelter under the excuse that his profession were not bound to take such oaths. The Bishop underlined the fact that he had avoided all oaths 'since the Queen began her reign'. We know of no action taken against him and he appeared as one of the quorum in the commission of 1562, but died in the following year. His wife left a definitely Catholic will and his family were mostly papist recusants by the 1570's. Robert Lawson was omitted from the 1562 commission, but Michael Wandesford appears on the quorum. In 1563 a new Statute imposed the penalties of *Praemunire* on attorneys or administrators of the law who refused the Oath of Supremacy. Lambarde, long after, thought this statute was not always enforced. Nevertheless we may suppose that most of

the new Bench of 1562 must have taken the Oath. Yet in 1564 Archbishop Young reported that of sixteen active Justices, six (Sir Christopher Danby, Leonard Dacre, Thomas Rokeby, John Sayer of Worsall, Michael Wandesford and Anthony Catterick of Stanwick) were 'no favourers of religion'. Of the ten whom he listed as favourers, two were really doubtful—Sir Nicholas Fairfax of Gilling and Roger Radcliffe of Mulgrave—and another, Walter Strickland of Croft, was soon to be in trouble because of his wife's suspect behaviour. The Archbishop proposed six to replace the suspects. One of these was Sir Christopher Metcalfe of Nappa, who had just been reported as harbouring Dr Marshall, a runagate popish priest. Another was William Tankard. Tankard was a counsellor-at-law, recorder of York from 1536 to 1573, member of the Council of the North from 1564 to 1572, steward of the court of Knaresborough and long a Justice for the West Riding and Ripon. He lived at Boroughbridge, but his family was soon to move to Brampton in the North Riding. He now moved on to the North Riding Bench and Council of the North, of which he became a feed member—one of its small active nucleus. It is clear that he was a complete conformist—though we do not know if he evaded the Oath of Supremacy—and yet a known papist at heart. He helped in the prosecutions of the rebels of 1569 at York and Ripon; yet in 1572 Gargrave thought him 'doubtful or newter', and Huntingdon, more forthrightly, had him eased off the Council and wrote to Cecil:

. . . he is much grieved at his displacing and they will labour to bring him into the Commission of the Peace again, but I trust that you will not hear of it. It were better to displace more of the Papists still in the Commission than to bring him in again. If all I hear be true of him, he escaped well. . . .

Archbishop Young's list of Richmondshire Justices of 1564 has twelve, of whom six are unfavourable to religion (Sir William Ingleby of Ripley, Richard Norton of Wath, Christopher Wyvill of Masham, William Wycliffe of Wycliffe, Anthony Catterick of Marrick and Anthony Rokeby of Rokeby) and three others 'good Justices though not very favourable'—the same William

Tankard, Sir Christopher Danby and Michael Wandesford. He proposes three changes, and of his three new men, Roger Brough of Catterick was later thought 'doubtful' by Gargrave, and Roger Hebblethwaite, the Commissary of the Archdeaconry, was, as we have already seen, not much trusted. All of this makes very evident the distaste for the establishment amongst the gentry—especially if we note the absence of the names of Sir Richard Cholmley and his heir Francis (accounted definite 'mislikers' in 1562-4), the Privy Council's fears of Sir Christopher Danby and Cholmley, and the clear charge in 1568 that Sir Nicholas Fairfax and his heir were 'mislikers'.

We are given glimpses of another 'misliker' in action. Christopher Lascelles of Sowerby, Thirsk was an associate of the northern Earls. In May 1562 he and Francis Lascelles of Breckembrough were both imprisoned briefly by the York High Commission. The charge against Christopher was that 'he did speak certain opprobrious words openly in Downholme church' to the disturbance of the vicar's conducting of a service—the terms used imply pretty clearly that Lascelles spoke loudly and contemptuously of the form of service. Francis seems to have done something similar in Grinton church. In July of the same year the Common Council of York took cognisance of a charge that Christopher at a dinner party in York had been ready to bet a very mixed company that roods, with Mary and John, would be up again in all churches before Christmas that year. He also was alleged to have said that the warmest and best fire he had seen in London was in Queen Mary's days at the burning of one Gibson, a heretic. These sentiments were not his own invention. The authorities were then very alarmed about the currency of rumours and prognostications in the county. There exists a small bundle of such prophecies current in the north in the 1560's, some in Latin, some in English, verse and prose, some wildly apocalyptic, others looking to decisive intervention by Philip II or the Emperor. Edward More of Barnbrough in the West Riding was writing prognostications at this time, others were being passed from hand to hand in the East Riding, and their unsettled, expectant feeling is echoed in a few wills and examina-

tions of suspects. By 1568 Lascelles was very busy with the Earls' friends.⁽⁶⁸⁾

We have already remarked on the relative frequency of the traditional preamble or Catholic habitual expressions in North Riding wills throughout the years before 1569. So, for example, in May 1559 Margaret Chaise of Overton, widow, leaves a rosary to Mrs Nelson; in June 1559 a son-in-law of Reynold Beseley, the York advocate, and brother-in-law of Edward Beseley, requires them to supervise the bequests, including four half-pound candles of wax to be burned over him at his burial; in October 1559 William Layton, gent., of Sproxton, Helmsley, asks the curate to pray for him and all Christian souls; in April 1559 an Ayton widow leaves a rosary for prayers for her soul; in May 1559 a serving man of William Wycliffe of Wycliffe leaves money round his fellow servants for prayers for his soul and 'to the high altar in worship of the holy sacrament'; in November 1559 Richard Crosby, Crown auditor for monastic lands in Richmondshire, uses the old preamble; in March 1560 Ann Lademan, an ex-nun, of Gaterley, Richmond, leaves several crucifixes and rosaries; Ralph Rokeby, Esq., of Marske in Cleveland (old preamble, but full royal title, May 1564); Joan Wycliffe, widow, of Richmond (November 1562, Lord Chief Justice Wray's mother, rosaries); Ralph Cleasby, gent., of Thirntoft (December 1562, a Latin primer); Thomas Rokeby, Esq., of Mortham (August 1567, a gold crucifix in the chamber in which he lay); Christopher Bowes of Angram Grange (1568, to be prayed for at church); George Constable of Lund, gent. (1569, to every widow of Lund to pray for his soul); John Hart of Brotton (1569, twopence each to named poor to pray for his soul); Elizabeth Crathorne, gentlewoman, widow of Crathorne (1568, old preamble); George Conyers, gent., of Pinchingthorpe, Guisborough (1569, a strong old preamble; supervisor his nephew, Doctor Roger Lee, the notorious York papist); George Conyers, Esq., of Whitby (January 1569, strong preamble).⁽⁶⁹⁾

The 1569 rising forced some of this lay religious conservatism into nonconformist action. The surviving records of the rising,

oddly enough, still await a modern historian. But a cursory examination of such of the records as are most readily available—including two newly discovered sources, lists of fines and of pardons of rebels and sympathisers—makes some conclusions possible. It is certain that the North Riding was the only part of Yorkshire to be seriously affected; over 2,000 pardons were issued there, about 200 in the West Riding and a tiny handful in the East Riding. In the North Riding, rebels or active helpers existed in every parish except Wensley in Hang West (belonging to Lord Scrope), in Gilling West Barningham (Tunstall, but its service books were torn up), Brignall (Scrope), Marrick (Sayer), Marske (Philip), Rokeby (Rokeby), Startforth (Fulthorpes—who were rebels; and its books defaced), Wycliffe (Wycliffe), in Gilling East Bolton on Swale (Scrope). In Allertonshire every parish was affected. In Birdforth the only parishes unaffected were small ones—Old Byland (Bellasis mainly), Cowesby, Cold Kirkby and Sutton (Archbishop of York) and—very oddly—East Harlsey (Leonard Dacre). In Cleveland the western half was totally affected, except for Hilton (Meynell of Hawnby), Ingleby Greenhow (Eure, though it contained a Percy estate), and Seamer (Sir Henry Gates—but the service books in the church were defaced). The eastern, seaside half was only slightly affected; there were no rebels or trouble at Brotton, Marske, Skelton (all Lord Conyers), Egton, Lythe, Hinderwell (all Radcliffe of Mulgrave), Danby (Lord Latimer), Easington (Gregory Conyers of Whitby), Liverton (Dawney), Loftus (Crown land), Westerdale (Yoward). The Cholmley stronghold of Whitby Strand and the whole of Pickering Lythe—where the Cholmleys, Sir Henry Gates and Lord Latimer were the chief landowners—were totally unaffected. In Bulmer seven parishes (Thormanby, Alne, Myton, Terrington, Stillington, Easingwold, Raskelf) had their service books defaced, but only three (Raskelf one, Crayke two, Kilburn six) produced rebels. Ryedale was also little affected, apart from the great rebel centre of Kirkby Moorside and Scawton and Bilsdale, which lost their service books.

The chief rebel centres were Northallerton (150), Kirkby Moorside (1110), Topcliffe (140), Thirsk (107), Aysgarth (the

whole vast parish—about 160), Richmond (54, but surprisingly few in the list of pardons), Bedale (115), Burneston (80–90), Coverham (67), Ainderby Steeple (70), Yarm (51), Stokesley (30), Masham (37). The tenants and servants of the chief rebels (the Earls, Dacre, the Nortons and Markenfields) seem to have provided rather more than a fifth of the rebel manpower from the Riding. The rest came from the musters raised by constables, tenantry of allied gentry, volunteers. So Thirsk, which belonged to Lord Derby, must have been brought out in such strength by the persuasions of the Markenfields and Lascelles who owned small manors there. Northallerton, the greatest single rebel centre perhaps, belonged to the Bishop of Durham; we can only presume that Markenfield influence there (from their small manor of Romanby) and general pressure in Allertonshire did their work.⁽⁷⁰⁾

We have already discussed the aloof attitude of many peers towards the rising. The absence of rebels from the Scrope head manor of Wensley must be significant—but elsewhere a good many rebels came from Scrope manors. In general there were some rebels from almost all the peers' estates. The attitude of the gentry towards the rebellion is a problem. In 1572 Northumberland said that he had sounded them (no doubt he meant the chief and most conservative amongst them) on their attitude towards action to help the Queen of Scots, and was shocked by the 'coldness' of the general response. Yet we have the excited and despondent judgments of officials like Sir George Bowes at the height of the rising that the great majority of the gentry (at least, outside the East Riding) sympathised with the rebels and only held aloof out of prudence, sending their younger sons and help to the Earls and themselves putting up an appearance of supporting the government. From what we have already surmised about the general religious situation and the economic position, and from the evidence of the rebel leaders' own chronic hesitancy, both of these statements were equally likely. A study of the rebel gentry seems to bear this out. We know of about 100 of them from the North Riding, of whom some thirty-three seem to have been tenants or servants or close relations of the chief

rebels. The thirty-three included nine Nortons, Edward Dacre, Benet Cholmley and Nicholas Fairfax (a younger son of Sir Nicholas, and servant of Northumberland). The other sixty-seven appear to have been independent landowners—but perhaps we should exclude from them Asculph Cleasby, Lord Conyers' agent, and half a dozen others who came from Conyers manors. There seems to be no doubt about the independent standing of men like Roger (who had been a servant of the Earl of Leicester) and Richard Meynell of North Kilvington, Thirsk, Anthony Bierley and William Grant of Roxby, Pickhill, John Fulthorpe of Islebeck, Simon Digby of Bedale, Leonard, John and William Metcalfe of Bear Park, Aysgarth, Christopher Lascelles, Christopher Danby, Peter and George Crathorne of Crathorne, Francis Fulthorpe of Thirkelby, Ralph and Richard Dodsworth (presumably of Thornton Watlass), Roger Lepton of Kepwick, William Franke of Knayton, Anthony Greene of Lanmoth, George Lepton of Birkby, Francis Layton of West Layton, Nicholas Gower of Thornaby, Ralph Tankard of Upsall, Leonard Smithson of Moulton, William Vaux of Crayke, Humphrey Cleasby of Thirntoft, Thomas Wray and John Gower of Richmond, Thomas Talbot of Thornton-le-Street, John Metham of Osmotherley, Richard Gascoigne of Cold Ingleby, Oswald Metcalfe of Wildon Grange, Henry Wycliffe of Kirkby Fletham, James Pennyman of Ormesby, Robert Pennyman of Stokesley (though perhaps he was an agent of Lord Eure there, and his execution due to the influence he threw on the side of the rebels), Cuthbert Witham of Brettanby, Robert Carlton of Thirsk, John Rydyard and John Chapman of Guisborough, Robert Tunstall of 'Stanfraye', Richard Pepper of Long Cowton, Wilfred Meynell of Halnaby, William Metcalfe of Hemming. But it seems very noticeable that only Christopher Danby amongst these was a member of one of the greater landowning gentry families. Apart from Danby and the Nortons, the only connection between these latter and the rising was a very few younger son servants of the Earls (Nicholas Fairfax, Benet Cholmley) and the appearance of some tenants from their estates. Sir William Bellasis of Newburgh held so aloof that the rebels sacked some of his properties. The

Cholmleys held back markedly; the rebel lists contain no Pudseys, Radcliffes, Lawsons, Rokebys, Metcalfes of Nappa, Gowers of Stittenham, Mauleverers, Constables, Conyers of Sockburne. In a list made by Gargrave in 1572 of the most wealthy and able gentry, not a single one of the fourteen marked as North Riding Catholics had been associated with the rebellion.⁽⁷¹⁾

The social and economic realities of the day conditioned the government's treatment of the rebels as much as it did the rebels' own behaviour. There was the same—to our view—odd and paradoxical mixture of rigid dogmatic principle and very utilitarian flexibility which characterises so much of Tudor society and administration. In the government's eyes the punishment of the rebels must be a public exhibition *ad terrorem* of the horror of rebellion against lawful authority and of popery—in that they shared the same frame of ideas as Christopher Lascelles on the Catholic side. But equally political and economic realism required a good deal of mercy, if the Riding were not to be left ungovernable and devastated, and the exaction of fines wherever possible, if the expenses of the royal army were ever to be paid. At first it was proposed to execute six- to seven-hundred, not counting prisoners taken in the field. But even so, the principle was laid down that rebels with freehold property or any wealth should be stayed for further consideration. In the end it seems that comparatively few were executed (fifty-seven in Richmondshire, an unknown number—perhaps twenty at most—at Yarm, Guisborough, Great Ayton, Thirsk and Northallerton, and six leaders—Northumberland, Christopher and Thomas Norton, Simon Digby of Aiskew, John Fulthorpe of Islebeck, Robert Pennyman of Stokesley—at York and London). Westmorland, Leonard Dacre, Richard, Sampson and Francis Norton, Robert Heighington of Richmond (Northumberland's secretary), John Gower of Richmond, John and Ingram Thwing of Upper Helmsley, Christopher Danby, Christopher Neville of Kirkby Moorside and probably Leonard Metcalfe of Bear Park, Aysgarth made good their escape to Flanders. The rest—which included the vast majority of the rebel gentry, since we know of no gentry

amongst those executed in the countryside—seem all to have been pardoned at a price. Some, like the two Crathornes, first bought ‘protections’ from the southern royal army, which, having to finance its way, lived off the land on its road through Ripon and Boroughbridge to Durham, and sold protections freely. Rebels taken by the Earl of Sussex’s army from York were gaoled in Durham or Carlisle, and, on the usual principles of the time, charged entry fees and a sum ranging, in accordance with a rough means test, between 6s. 8d. and 3s. 4d. a week for their keep. As usual also, since the gaols were too small, the easy course was taken of releasing many on bonds. Meanwhile the sheriff was ordered to seize, and make an inventory of, the lands and goods of all rebels and sympathisers. Furious rows developed between the York officials and the officers of the royal southern army, who had already despoiled many rebels’ houses and estates. Also relatives of gentry rebels were making full use of the many family bonds which existed in their closely inbred class, to buy pardons. These separate pardons, obtained by influence, extended even to a good many of those attainted. Then the remaining rebels were summoned to sue for pardon. The cost was a fine (ranging between 20s. and 40s. for the average gentry), settlement of the sheriff’s expenses, the fee for the pardon (non-gentle rebels were usually lumped together, ten to a pardon, for cheapness), and the taking of an oath of submission equivalent in its terms to the Oath of Supremacy. We certainly hear of a few rebels who refused pardons proffered (John Gower of Richmond, Leonard Metcalfe of Bear Park, Oswald Metcalfe of Wildon Grange, Anthony King of Masham), and for some years after 1570 local authorities were required to make returns to Westminster of runagate unpardoned rebels. Nevertheless there is no good reason to doubt that the vast majority of the rebels took the Oath and bought pardon.

The outcome of this was a considerable turnover of landed property in the Riding—though not so great as we might think. The Percy estate was forfeit to the Crown by attainder, but by 1577 the next heir, Sir Henry Percy, had secured a decision of the Judges that an entail in the Marian grant of both peerage

and estates overrode the attainder. However the new Earl did not receive the all-important stewardships of Richmond and Middleham (which went to Lord Scrope, who thereby became very powerful in Richmondshire), the houses and woods had suffered considerable damage, and he was so suspect that he was not allowed to reside anywhere in the north and settled at Petworth in Sussex. After the 1580's—no doubt with the damage acting as an incentive—the Percy estates were much improved; but Percy political influence in the Riding remained in eclipse. Leonard Dacre's own moderate-sized estate was lost by attainder and dispersed. The main Dacre estate, which he had claimed in vain (and for which his youngest brother fought a long legal battle till almost 1600), eventually passed intact to Lord William Howard of Naworth and his heirs and became the basis of the late seventeenth-century Earls of Carlisle's Castle Howard estate. Westmorland's comparatively modest North Riding properties were lost by attainder and dispersed by Crown sales.

Amongst the North Riding rebel gentry sixteen were threatened with attainder. Only two of these had large properties—Richard Norton and John Fulthorpe. Both were lost and dispersed by sales. However, neither family suffered a total eclipse. Of the fourteen other smaller estates, eight were lost and sold, and the remaining six rescued by their owners. Two of the eight remained, in part, the maintenance of women relatives of the rebel owners for the rest of their lives and then were sold. Of the six saved, the Lascelles family showed most ingenuity. They seem to have established that Christopher, the head of the family, was only the legal owner of one manor, Sowerby by Thirsk. Although Sowerby was confiscated, the Lascelles, at a price, contrived to lease it from a whole series of Crown tenants until about 1598, when they bought it in. To raise the purchase money they granted new leases to the tenants (for 2,000 years, at high entry fines and low rents) and were nevertheless forced by 1601 to sell the manor. Asculph Cleasby was due for attainder, and then pardoned because, as the agent of the last Lord Conyers, he alone could secure the marriage of one of the co-heiresses to a son of Lord Hunsdon. He retained his property and, in the follow-

ing years, was engaged in land speculations. Christopher Lockwood, Westmorland's secretary, was attainted, but it seems that the ingenious Lascelles family saved his estate, partly by establishing that he was the legal owner of only a small part of his family's lands, partly by convincing the judges that even what he seemed to own was the property of Lascelles trustees. Roger Meynell of Kilvington was attainted, but found to be the legal owner only of his goods—bought back from the sheriff—and of a few small leasehold properties. Leonard Metcalfe's undoubted recovery of Bear Park, Aysgarth, is a mystery. He seems to have gone into exile and then returned home. John and Ingram Thwing were attainted and fled abroad. But after some years of active service of the Catholic cause there, both returned home—suspect but apparently pardoned—and resumed ownership of Upper Helmsley. We are uncertain whether to include in this list the ninth case, of Oswald Metcalfe of Wildon Grange. He was a younger brother of Sir Christopher Metcalfe of Nappa, and, as a rebel refusing pardon, was due to lose his property in 1570. That property then consisted only of a Crown lease of Wildon grange (ex-monastic) and the reversion of lands in Skelton, Overton, bought from the Nelson family. He may well have lost these, but by 1577 he was again a landowner in the Riding, prospering and buying a third of the Conyers manor of Hornby Castle.⁽⁷²⁾

It is not easy to estimate the immediate effects of the collapse of the rising on the Catholic cause in the Riding, largely because Catholicism was still so amorphous a phenomenon. From 1559 it had never had determined, clear-headed and generally accepted leadership; after 1569 it lacked even that partial leadership which the Earls had supplied. As we have seen, the seminary priests cannot have made any considerable impact on the Riding before 1582. For obvious reasons we are quite in the dark about the relative proportions of reconciled Catholics and unreconciled conservatives. In 1569 it is likely that the reconciled were in a very small minority; by 1571 Marian priests with faculties to reconcile were at work. But even reconciliation did not by any means necessarily mean that the reconciled became at once a complete recusant, avoiding all church-going and communicating

in Anglican churches. There were a few rigid recusants in the 1560's; by 1576 they were becoming more numerous, but, as we shall see, they remained a minority amongst the Catholic-minded. There was apparently a strong body of opinion which regarded at least occasional conformity as justifiable—that is to say that the reconciled should behave much as he had done when he was a conservative 'misliker', going to Mass and the Sacraments when he could, and meanwhile attending Anglican services silently. It seems that many of these 'Church papists' drew the line at communicating in Anglican churches or taking the Oath of Supremacy—though there does seem to be evidence that some found reasons to justify communicating (like the Yorkshire Cambridge undergraduates at Caius in 1578–9 who argued with their recusant companions that it was justifiable if the communicant treated the consecrated elements as merely bread and wine). Also the whole question of the Pope's deposing power, the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, and, more profoundly, 'Conciliarist' principles about Papal authority, was undoubtedly regarded by the better educated as highly disputable.⁽⁷³⁾

Between 1570 and 1579 about 130 laypeople in the Riding were accused of Catholicism, and the overwhelming majority of them were gentry. Some thirty-two or thirty-three of them were obstinate, complete recusants. This hard core was mainly concentrated just north of York and in Richmondshire—not in Cleveland. At Huntington there was a group of five—the wife of John Foster, a coroner, the wife of Thomas Agar, a York attorney, Seth Holme, gent., and two other women. Mrs Agar spent a year in gaol and was released to house arrest in 1579. Foster—himself suspect—was called to the Archbishop, but his wife refused to yield. It is likely—though not certain—that Holme returned to the practice of occasional conformity. The two other women remained firm in spite of a spell in the York Kidcote. At Overton Edward Beseley, the Marian York official, and his wife Bridget were in constant trouble. He was cited for obstinate recusancy in January 1572, and gaoled; by March 1573 he went to church but refused to communicate, in spite of conferences with a divine. In 1575 he was released from York

Castle for a period to ride abroad to recover his health. In 1576 he was again released on bond for a time, to live in his house in York. Later in the year, on his return to the Castle, he flatly refused to go to church any more. After several other short periods of release to houses in York, he consented to go to church by July 1577—otherwise he would have forfeited a bond of £200. His wife had meanwhile passed over to full recusancy and was also gaoled. By 1578 both were at large on bonds to certify communicating. There is no evidence that they did, and in 1580 they still had ahead of them a long history of trouble for their recusancy. These were the years in which the three Nelsons were leaving Overton for Douai, but neither they nor their mother appear in the presentments. At Sheriff Hutton old Sir Edward Gower and his wife were obstinate recusants in 1577, but appear to have remained unmolested. He died in 1579 leaving a Catholic will. At Sutton on the Forest there were five women recusants, apparently unmolested also, and a widow at Myton.⁽⁷⁴⁾

At Richmond there was one obstinate total recusant, John Garth yeoman, and a group of seven others whose offence ranged from non-communicating with very rare attendances at church (John Gower's widowed mother, Thomas Wray, Esq.—a capital burgess, elder brother of Chief Wray—and his wife) to attendance at church but non-communicating (like Dame Alice Sedgwick, an ex-prioress). In Aysgarth there were eight offenders; one, Roger Metcalfe, was a determined recusant who defied the High Commission, Leonard Metcalfe (the returned rebel) of Bear Park was a complete recusant but at least told the Commissioners he was willing to swear he would conform (in the event he did not); Henry Metcalfe of Bear Park was a recusant but excused himself as having no certain home; the rest were at least occasional conformists suspect of popery. Two or three others are identifiable as rebels or sympathisers with them. At Fingall Christopher Wyvill, Esq., the head of the family of Burton Constable, was a most obstinate recusant. In October 1571 he was gaoled by the High Commission for this and blank refusal to take an oath to answer their questions. He was still in gaol in February 1573, and was freed on a verbal promise that he

and his wife would go to church. At Michaelmas, when he was due to reappear to prove their conformity, his son, Marmaduke Wyvill, J.P., came to say his father was ill and to take a bond for his appearance. The case dragged on to 1575, with Christopher sending repeated excuses, or appearing once and not again. In October 1575 the High Commission seems to have given up the fight; he was let go on a bond to appear on twenty days' warning, but apparently never recalled. His wife was a Scrope. At Fingall also, in 1571, Francis Lascelles, gent., (son of the rebel, Christopher), a recusant, took bond to conform, and in 1575 the wife of William Wyvill did the same. There seems to be no evidence that they did so. At Hauxwell in 1579 four gentry were offenders. William Thoresby, Esq., and his wife of Barden were merely non-communicants and certified their conformity. Two others were full recusants; one certified conformity, the other did not. At Thornton Steward Henry Scrope, Esq., of Danby, was found to be a recusant in 1571, but in the following year, under pressure, he certified his full conformity.

The evidence for Masham is fuller. Sir Thomas Danby moved round his various houses in the North and West Ridings and was difficult to catch. In November 1572, after two years of searching, he was brought to the High Commission and accused of being a non-communicant. He certified one Communion at Masham, but was admonished to communicate thrice a year and threatened with penalties if he relapsed. Gargrave, at the time, was writing him down as a papist of the worst kind. In 1573 the Commissioners were seeking him again, apparently in vain. Marmaduke Wyvill, Esq., of Masham (eldest son of the recusant Christopher Wyvill of Fingall), was discovered to be a non-communicant and (most probably) irregular at church in 1572; on challenge he at once conformed. Some years later he became a North Riding Justice and, much later, a baronet. Also from Masham there are a series of revealing depositions of 1577 made to the High Commission. The curate deposed that Richard King and his wife were never at church. He went to see King who said nothing, even when the curate threatened to inform on him to the High Commission or Justices. Instead of proceeding with his

threat, the curate then interviewed King's wife, who admitted they were recusants in conscience 'and desired this examine earnestly to bear with them and they would consider this examine his pains'—presumably a hint at a bribe, in days when the curate's living depended on his parishioners. The curate let them be for a time, but since they still did not come to church he had them presented as recusants. On receiving a process from the High Commission, King fled. The curate also deposed that it was rumoured that King had communicated at the hands of 'some Mass priest in a corner', that his daughter-in-law had never communicated at Masham, and that another man was an ex-rebel and suspected of disobedience in religion. A parishioner deposed that, on the word of five certain ex-rebels of 1569, King had been a rebel and had not been known to have a pardon. But he had seen King once at Masham church, on a Christmas day.

A Catholic report of a Gainforth gentleman perhaps belongs to this period. James Brighthouse, son-in-law of Sir Christopher Metcalfe of Nappa, 'lived always in such sort as no man could tell what religion he favoured for he never talked of matters of faith but lived as a civil worldly man with both sides suffering every one to say what he would'. After long serving Lord Scrope at Carlisle on Marcher service, he came home to die and suddenly asked his Protestant wife to bring him a Catholic priest. She brought him the curate whom he repelled as a schismatic as much as himself. He then assembled his household and 'protested he was a Catholic . . . that for worldly respects he had followed the Queen in her religion which was damnable heresy to his utter damnation. Marvel not, saith he, that I speak this plain, for I am going to a place where she is nothing feared . . .'.⁽⁷⁵⁾

At Patrick Brompton in 1579 the wife of William Wyvill, gent., took a bond to conform, but then fled and could not be found. Her husband, a younger son of the Constable Burton family, and she were roving round friends in these years, presented in several places, but apparently not brought to conformity. At Well in 1573 an obstinate recusant, probably a servant of the Wyvills, also seems to have evaded pressure by the High Commission. At Kirklington the men of the Wandesford

family (of whom one had been a rebel) were Church-papists to the point of never being presented for recusancy or non-commun-icating, but were suspected by Gargrave. At Ainderby Steeple in 1575-7 there were several obstinate recusant gentry (John Rokeby and his wife—most probably the heir to Mortham, then moving round relations' houses and presented in succession here and at Yafforth—William Markenfield, gent., who was probably a rebel, and one Conyers). Most of this party soon afterwards appeared at Danby Wiske. In 1575 one Christopher Conyers, gent., was being sought at Great Langton by the High Commission, and at Great Smeaton in 1578 the churchwardens sorted one apparently genuine recusant from a group of men who often dodged church. At Forcett in 1571 the High Commissioners tried to have served their process on the men of the Pudsey family, who moved round the family's houses at Arnforth and Bolton by Bowland in the West Riding and Barforth in Forcett. None of them seem to have taken any part in the 1569 rising, though they were clients of Sir Henry Percy, the new Earl of Northumberland. Stephen Pudsey, a recusant, was perhaps persuaded to conform, or perhaps he got away. Thomas Pudsey, the head of the family, evaded the Commission until October 1573, when he was put in York Castle as a very obstinate papist recusant. In 1574 and again in 1575 he was temporarily released during the summer months, on bonds to return and 'not to inveigh against the religion established'. He had a third period of restricted liberty in the spring of 1576, and then '*penitus recusavit adire ad ecclesiam*'. He died, still a prisoner in York Castle, in September 1576.

At Sedbury, Gilling Jane, wife of Richard Gascoigne, Esq.—a daughter of old Richard Norton the rebel—was reputed to be a shelterer of exiled rebels on their furtive visits to England. In 1575 the High Commission found her a handful and seem to have been content (apparently without much success) to try to extract from her a promise to go to church. In 1577 she and her household (in 1584 her husband was a lunatic and had probably been such for some years) were regarded by the Archbishop as obstinate papist recusants. In 1578 the Gilling churchwardens

(and not for the last time) merely presented that they were not certain that she and her husband were communicants. From June to August she was committed to house arrest in York by the High Commission, and then released on a bond to return on four days' warning. This was only the start of her long career as a determined recusant. At Dalton in Kirkby Ravensworth in 1577 the widow Wycliffe was an obstinate recusant, but apparently left unmolested. Somewhere in the neighbourhood, also in 1577, were Marmaduke Norton, gent., and his wife, obstinate recusants. Marmaduke was a son of Richard Norton and a rebel, who had been released from the Tower in 1572. At Marske (Richmondshire) was Robert Rokeby, gent., who was gaoled by the High Commission in 1571. There seems to be no evidence that he had been a rebel. He was charged with non-communicating, going to church but walking and talking there in service-time, and receiving popish priests into his house for Mass, keeping Massing stuff for them ('copes, images, chests, forbidden books, vestments and other massing stuff'). He also was treating the vicar of Marske with disrespect. His servant was an absolute recusant. Released on bond to conform and yield up his massing stuff, he simply did nothing but return feeble excuses. By March 1573 he and his servant had had interviews with Archbishop Grindal and were bound again to conform. The record breaks off here. At Stanwick St John in 1575 Robert Lambert, gent., a pardoned rebel, was found to be a complete recusant, but he rapidly conformed under pressure. Anthony Catterick, whom Gargrave regarded as a moderate papist, evaded all prosecution until 1580. In December 1577 he was accused of harbouring Catholic refugees from county Durham and appeared before the High Commission—to be let go after an assurance that he would inform on them if they came to him again. No charge even of non-communicating was made against him.⁽⁷⁶⁾

In spite of their supposed family connection with the famous John Wycliffe, and their recent family alliances with the Bowes of Streatlam and the Eure family, the Wycliffes of Wycliffe early showed a decidedly Catholic bias. In 1564 William Wycliffe, the head of the family and a North Riding Justice, was accounted

unfavourable to Protestantism. He remained aloof from the 1569 rising, but a relation, Henry Wycliffe of Kirkby Fletham, was a rebel. By 1572 Gargrave held that William and his eldest son, Francis, were papists of the worst sort. Suspicion had already fallen on the rector of Wycliffe, as we have seen, for making his parsonage a centre for Mass and reconciling priests. The evidence for this had been supplied by outside informers; in fact presentments by the Wycliffe churchwardens always seem to have been scanty. The Wycliffe family themselves were not mentioned in the original information on reconcilers and the rector. In 1575 Francis Wycliffe—seemingly due to another informer, and not a presentment—was brought to the High Commission from Coxhow in Co. Durham, charged with recusancy, and soon certified he had been to church. He was admonished to continue and conform fully, but his case then vanishes from the court book; in fact he became a 'vagrant' papist for years after this, constantly moving his residence. His father remained unmolested until 1580.

Apart from the two groups of obstinate recusants in the vicinity of York and in Richmondshire, cases were few elsewhere in the Riding. In Birdforth, at Hawnby, Roger Meynell, Esq., was a full recusant, though perhaps willing to conform occasionally, his brother Cuthbert was an obstinate recusant (he confessed he had been little to church since 1559, and was not moved by conferences with the Archbishop and Dean) but forced to move house frequently, and their mother was either an unmolested recusant or a conformist conservative. Francis Fulthorpe, the heir of John Fulthorpe of Islebeck, the rebel, was an obstinate recusant who occasionally appeared at Hawnby or Crathorne. At Thirsk Francis Parkinson, who had helped the rebels, was a very definite recusant, gaoled in York Castle in 1570. He admitted that he had been reconciled to the Church, confessed that 'the Pope the Bishop of Rome is supreme head of the Catholic Church' and said he would 'stick to that opinion until death by God's grace'. He was still in the Castle in January 1576 and when questioned about a statement he was alleged to have made, that 'the Host being once consecrated by a Catholic priest would bleed being

pricked with a pin', he 'now said that his meaning was that there was present in the Host the real body of Christ the Host being consecrated. He is not sorry for his reconciliation; he refuseth to come to the church.' He was removed to the Hull blockhouses in January 1577. At Topcliffe in 1571 one Whippe, apparently either a recusant or a violently contemptuous 'misliker' conservative, was put briefly into York Castle and released with an admonition to be obedient. In Allertonshire, at Birkby in 1575 Thomas Grimston, his son Marmaduke and their schoolmaster were presented by the churchwardens as non-communicants. This may or may not have been a euphemism; in 1578 Thomas Grimston and his wife and another son were recusants at their main home in Holderness. In 1579 the whole family were at Little Smeaton, Birkby and put on bond to conform. There is no record that they certified conformity. At North Kilvington the Meynells and Talbots were lying low and licking their wounds after the rebellion. Roger Talbot went to church and communicated very infrequently indeed. Richard Meynell was at Lincoln's Inn, apparently a complete recusant. He was brought before the Bishop of London and sequestered by the authorities of the Inn; they suspected that he was reconciled, but could get no evidence of it. John Brackenbury, gent., and his wife, cousins of the Meynells recently arrived from Co. Durham, were suspect recusants. Roger Meynell and his heir Thomas were ignored, though Thomas' commonplace book implies that Roger was a conformist conservative and he himself a 'vagrant' recusant.

The positive evidence of recusancy in Cleveland in these years is very small. Francis Fulthorpe, an obstinate recusant, sometimes stayed with the Crathornes at Crathorne. At Ormesby the rebel Asculph Cleasby was lying low and apparently conforming. At Seamer there was one man recusant; at Stainton one Maltby recusant and Cuthbert Marshall, gent., then up at Furnival's Inn, was a suspect recusant. At Yarm (or Worsall) John Sayer, Esq., accounted a moderate papist by Gargrave, was unnoticed or a conformist, and there was one persistent non-communicant. At Guisbrough the Tocketts family was the only one in Cleveland

to show real obstinacy. They do not seem to have played any part in the rebellion. Roger Tocketts, Esq., went to York Castle in November 1571 for obstinate recusancy. Apart from several holidays on bond (not to inveigh against Protestantism) he was there until October 1576, steadily refusing conformity and even to take an oath to answer to the charges against him. He was moved in October to Hull. In January 1578 he was sent for three months to Sir George Bowes at Streatlam, but returned to gaol unchanged. His two sons, George and Richard, seem to have evaded appearance in court by constantly changing their residences. Guisborough had two or three other suspects, and Kirkleatham two who were constantly moving house. At Lythe Roger Radcliffe, Esq., a successful improver of his estate and a Justice, was accounted a Protestant in 1564 and 1572. He left a conservatively-phrased will, mentioning an heirloom apparently left to him by Robert Pursglove. Apart from this, all that was amiss was a suspicion that Richard Salvin, the deprived incumbent of Hinderwell, was living at Borrowby, and a tendency for Radcliffe to entertain recusants. In 1576 he housed Robert Morton—a recusant and nephew of Dr Nicholas Morton, soon to leave for Rome—for three months. In 1577 he received several recusant refugees from Co. Durham. At Marske there were two or three non-communicants and occasional conformists. In spite of Gargrave's view that Sir Richard Cholmley was still a moderate papist, he was never presented for any degree of nonconformity either at Whitby or Roxby during these years, and there were no other cases at all at Whitby. At Scarborough in 1575 some twenty men were presented for infrequent attendance at church and another thirty-two for coming late habitually and refusing to pay fines for non-attendance. This brings up acutely a problem in interpreting court book evidence throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Clandestine marriages and even burials of excommunicates were common, so that it is not easy to disentangle Catholic ones from their background; was lax attendance at church also endemic amongst those who had no Catholic leanings? To judge from presentments, the case of the Scarborough men was very unusual and the vast

majority everywhere went to church very regularly. There is evidence that those whose occupations took them away from home a good deal—mariners, fishermen, merchants, hucksters, servants of the gentry—provided a difficulty for conscientious churchwardens. Thus throughout the two centuries it is almost impossible to make out from the Scarborough Quarter Sessions records of those presented for non-attendance at church whether any were genuine recusants. Considering this, and the fact that many North Riding parishes were extremely large and now ill-provided with chapels of ease, we are tempted to think that there may well have been a much larger amount of casual laxity in attendance than is shown in presentments—we have already seen a Masham curate only presenting those who seemed confirmed recusants or slackers. If this is so, quite considerable numbers of 'vagrant' recusants and of occasional conformist Catholics—as well as completely conformist conservative 'mislikers'—could have escaped record. In 1572 Gargrave included in his North Riding lists Simon Dodsworth, gent., (of Thornton Watlass?) and Roger Burgh, Esq., of Brough as 'doubtful', and added at the end 'and many mo evyll and dowbtfull'. He was only concerned to list gentry of sufficient wealth and education to be considered for the Commission of the Peace. Also we have at least to consider the possibility that there may have been extreme Protestant or simply irreligious or bewildered 'neuter' recusants. But it does seem that Protestant sectaries were practically non-existent in the Riding in the 1570's and really 'neuter' or 'atheist' mislikers, met with in the 1560's, are not mentioned in the 1570's.

The years 1580-2 saw a remarkable and systematic drive against recusancy by the Earl of Huntingdon. It seems very clear that the purpose of this was not a final drive to extinguish an insignificant body of recusants; on the contrary, the drive was the result of an official view that there was a good deal of recusancy, that it had been concealed in great measure by the connivance of churchwardens and Justices, and was actually now sharply increasing. After the 1569 rising the Privy Council began to demand more frequent and fuller returns of recusants, and to rate local authori-

ties more violently. In December 1572 a system of monthly local returns was begun; by November 1574 the Privy Council accused the Justices of frequently omitting the names of known recusants of standing related to themselves. Even some Justices, contrary to their promises to the President, were setting a bad example by not going to church. By October 1576 the North Riding Justices were being blamed for their last returns, which omitted 'many known offenders'. In January 1577 the Bench was ordered to see that the constables of each wapentake were 'godly and discreet men that favour religion'. That year the Inns of Court and Universities were combed for recusant northerners. In June 1578 a royal letter to the Justices complained that all these admonitions and orders had been 'so lightly regarded and slightly passed over' in Quarter Sessions, either due to 'the simplicity of the jury' or the stubborn refusal of the Justices to set aside sufficient time for the mass of new paper-work. We can detect behind all this the difficult position the government found itself in, still—as Gargrave's lists of the county's pool of able gentry manpower showed—forced to employ considerable numbers of local men whose family ties and personal conservatism made them very unfit weapons against recusancy.⁽⁷⁷⁾

That is the background to the drive of 1580. In May 1580 the Earl of Huntingdon had paid a visit to Richmond, ostensibly to view the musters, but actually to test for himself reports he had received of 'a great and sudden declining of many in those parts', by observation and by inviting the chief gentry of Richmondshire to accompany him to church on Sunday to the Whitsuntide Communion. Probably as a result of his report on this, a new High Commission was issued in June to the Bishop of Chester and Huntingdon instructed by Walsingham to aid the bishop in its use. On the 2nd of August the President met the bishop at Richmond with his Commissioners, a special jury of 'very zealous and sufficient burgesses' of Richmond was panelled, and on their presentments, the drive against recusancy in the Archdeaconry began. On the 8th the President, Archbishop of York, Sir William Fairfax of Gilling and Sir William Bellasis of Newburgh, High Commissioners and Councillors of the North, began

similar proceedings at Old Malton. They gave a charge to a specially picked jury for the deaneries of Bulmer and Buckrose, the wapentake of Ryedale and the liberty of Pickering Lythe. On the 18th they were at Ripon to charge another special jury for the wapentakes of Birdforth and Langbaugh, the liberties of Whitby Strand and Allertonshire.

We only have the names of the last two juries. The foreman of the Bulmer one was Edward Barton, Esq., of Whenby—forthwith put under bond to conform himself, wife and family. The only other esquire on his jury, Robert Elland of Nunnington, was put under bond for the same cause. Of the other eleven jurors—all gentry—one (Thomas Whalley) had a recusant wife, and four were in some way suspect through their relations. The foreman of the Langbaugh jury was Robert Rokeby of Marske, Esq., who had recusant relations and was himself, in later years, to be a recusant. Of his fellows, Robert Trotter, gent., of Skelton Castle had a Pudsey wife from Barforth and both were later recusants; John Bulmer of Pinchingthorpe had a Crathorne wife and many close recusant relations; Ralph Yoward of Westerdale and Stokesley belonged to a family containing recusants.

During 1580-2, as a result of presentments by these three juries, the York Commissioners dealt with 171 cases of recusancy. Of these, thirty-six each concerned a man, his wife and family, and the other 135 single individuals—hence really some 300 or more persons. We only have record of the first day's session of the Chester High Commission at Richmond—eighteen cases, concerning nineteen persons. Most, but not all of these Richmond cases were, in fact, followed up at York. We have no idea whether the Richmond court continued to function. Certainly the Bishop of Chester was back at Whalley on 8 August and writing of the one day session of 2 August as if it were all. If that were so, then the total of persons in Richmondshire caught by the drive amounted to no more, at the outside, than fifty of the North Riding total of 300. We can contrast this with the 1,500-2,000 caught in the West Riding and the 350-400 of the East Riding.

The session of 2 August at Richmond was not promising. Of

eighteen gentry summoned, twelve sent lame or even contumacious excuses. Thus Leonard Calvert, gent., of Kiplin simply sent a message that he had business to do for his master, Lord Wharton; Anthony Gatenby's house was barricaded against the pursuivant, Richard Cleborne of Killerby and his wife had vanished and neighbours said they had been last seen fleeing over Gatherley Race; Francis Wycliffe's servants at Snape cruelly abused and ridiculed the pursuivant. The eventual outcome of these eighteen cases and of the few others from Richmondshire dealt with later at York was equally inconclusive. William Wycliffe of Wycliffe, James Rokeby and William Thoresby at once hastened to conform. But Wycliffe had been a non-communicant and very occasional conformist; his 'conformity' in no way meant any change in his religious practice, and his refusal to communicate was tolerated by the Commissioners. The same is true of Thoresby, and, we may suspect (though there is no evidence in his case), of Rokeby. Only slightly different from this were the cases of Ralph Lawson, Esq., of Brough, Thomas Darcy, Esq., of Hornby Castle and Roger Gower, Esq., of Applegarth and Melsonby. Lawson was apparently only just in process of moving house from his estates in Newcastle. He seems to have been a 'Church-papist' who had only recently become a complete recusant. It took eleven days in York Castle to drive him back into occasional conformity—a practice which he seems to have maintained for the rest of his life. It is clear that his wife and family were very suspect, but no action was taken with them now or for some years to come. Darcy—hitherto unnoticed in presentments—under pressure eventually passed from recusancy to an occasional conformity which he also practised for the rest of his life; his wife was brought, through conferences with the Archbishop, to sermons, but did not conform; their family was unmolested. Roger Gower—elder brother of John Gower, the rebel and seminary priest—and his family behaved in precisely the same way now and hereafter. Then there were the obstinate. Jane Gascoigne of Sedbury underwent a short spell in York Castle and a course, dissuasive from popery, of house arrest at the Ripon home of Sir William Mallory (himself, however, officially

in good standing, a protector of Catholics). She emerged from all this still an obstinate recusant. Leonard Calvert of Kiplin and his wife and family were put under bond eventually at York to conform, but did not certify their conformity. Years later the authorities caught up with them again, Leonard collapsed into occasional conformity, but Catholicism remained in the family. Richard Cleborne and his wife evaded all processes successfully for some years until he was arrested in 1584 and gaoled in London for sheltering a seminary priest. Oswald Metcalfe of Hornby—the ex-rebel of Wildon Grange and brother of Sir Christopher Metcalfe of Nappa—had his case suspended *sine die*, yet he long remained a recusant. The same was true of Alice Whalley of Patrick Brompton. Francis Wycliffe—the heir to Wycliffe—and John Rokeby of Yafforth both fled. Wycliffe remained a most determined recusant all his life until his death in York Castle long afterwards. Rokeby was gaoled in London in 1581 as a shelterer of Edmund Campion.

It is glaringly obvious that the 1580-2 'catch' in Richmondshire contained a minority of the gentry families there already noted as Catholic in tendency—where were the Danbys, Scropes (Henry Scrope of Danby and his daughter, Mrs Hyndmarsh, were merely summoned to court in 1580 to take a bond not to shelter obstinate recusants), Wandesfords, Cattericks, Pudseys, Wyvills, Lascelles, Metcalfes of Bear Park, Nortons, Wrays, Spences, Tophams, Conyers, Burghs, Rokeby of Rokeby, Bulmers? Yet they almost all were still in the Catholic picture in the mid-1580's and 1590's. Equally obvious is the almost total absence of presentments of those below the gentry—apart from a few cases like Jerome Crook, apothecary of Richmond (who conformed) and Lucy Sedgwick also of Richmond ('a very perverse and obstinate papist and corrupter of divers gentlemen's children', who was imprisoned in Richmond town gaol).⁽⁷⁸⁾

In the rest of the Riding the proportions of the 'catch' corresponded pretty closely with pre-1580 presentments. The numbers of Cleveland recusants presented were still small—particularly small in seaside East Langbaugh. In all Langbaugh six families and thirty-nine individuals were presented; of these,

fourteen individuals came from the East side; Whitby Strand and Scarborough contributed another one family and seven individuals. In all East Langbaugh there were Jane Pennyman, gentlewoman, widow of Ormesby (left unmolested, most likely old), ten non-communicants at Stokesley (they included Ralph Yoward, gent.—Lord Eure's steward there—and his wife, the Brasses, Vicars, Rowntrees, who were all soon afterwards to be the basis of a recusant congregation there, but who now all promptly certified conformity), one doubtful non-communicant at Yarm. In Whitby Strand now appeared Henry Fairfax, gent. (Sir Nicholas Fairfax of Gilling's favourite grandson) and his wife of Dunsley, recusants who evaded conformity, and Margaret, wife of James Strangways, Esq., of Sneaton, an obstinate recusant, apparently left unmolested. At Scarborough, amidst half a dozen non-communicants, we can at least discern one woman who was a genuine case of conscience, who appeared before the Archbishop, but who does not seem to have conformed. In West Langbaugh the increase over earlier years was a little more manifest in the presentments. At Brotton half a dozen recusants (headed by Mrs Ellen Loggan) and non-communicants appeared; at Egton recusancy now first reached the courts—William Phillips yeoman, sent by Huntingdon to the Privy Council and gaoled in London (pretty certainly for a charge of sheltering a priest), Ralph Salvin, Esq., with wife and family (he offered conformity), John Salvin, gent., and family (escaped), Richard Smith, gent. (conformed completely), Robert Burton, an obstinate recusant, who nevertheless was charged with communicating in church but, at the last moment, 'contemptuously spitting out the wine', and half a dozen others. At Guisborough Roger Tocketts, Esq., was still in gaol, and Elizabeth and Helen Gower, gentlewomen, obstinate—but unmolested—recusants. At Kirkleatham there was one very doubtful recusant, at Loftus a doubtful vagrant and a recusant who conformed, at Lythe there were only three non-communicants (including Mrs Ellen Loggan, already dealt with at Brotton, and here presenting a certificate of conformity which the court treated with considerable suspicion). Lastly, at Skelton there were three recusants left untouched, but the others,

Mrs Catherine Conyers (daughter and heiress of John, Lord Conyers) and her family and Ralph Gower, Esq., his wife and family, duly certified their conformity after hesitations. Throughout these Cleveland cases—even amongst those who conformed so readily now—we repeatedly meet people who were to emerge again as Church-papists or recusants by 1590.

In Bulmer we meet again the familiar names of the group near York—at Huntington there were now fifteen recusants (including Robert Wright, Esq., and his wife, Seth Holme, Esq., the Agars), at Myton one family, at Heworth and Upper Helmsley Ingram and Katherine Thwing, at Sutton on Forest seven, at Stillington two, at Strensall five, at Terrington a whole nest of gentry (George Wildon, gent., Thomas Wildon, gent., and family, Katherine Wildon, Francis Metham, Esq., Richard Vavasour, gent., and family and another family), at Overton Edward Beseley and Christopher Baynes, gentlemen, at Whenby Edward Barton, Esq., and family, at Brafferton Mrs Elizabeth Thynne and servant, at Huttons Ambo Edward Gower, gent., with others at Haxby, Bulmer, Crambe and Crayke. This was clearly a bold example of that sudden recent increase of recusancy which the authorities feared—a group of some eighty-five people, much more numerous than the whole return from Richmondshire. They received severe treatment. A substantial majority certified conformity without much ado—particularly the heads of families. Some took evasive action, like Francis Metham and Seth Holmes (who escaped on a profession of willingness to be conformable). A very few were left unmolested. But the obstinate—Ingram Thwing, gent. (returned temporarily from Flanders in 1580, gaoled in London and released on bond, but overseas again by 1585), Mrs Thynne, her servant, Mrs Agar and three others at Huntington, Christopher Baynes (to Hull Blockhouses and then conformed) and Katherine Wildon—were gaoled. Edward Beseley was eventually traced in the West Riding and the Commission accepted a certificate of his full conformity sent from Adel. Mrs Agar was eventually banished from the county. By 1582 the authorities must have been satisfied that they had much reduced recusancy in Bulmer—in fact it was driven underground

or into occasional conformity, often to emerge again by the 1590's.

The very small pre-1580 number of recusants in Ryedale had increased in the same proportion. Sir William Fairfax of Gilling, in his youth 'unsound in religion', by 1572 thought to be a moderate conformist Catholic, was officially certified by Huntingdon in 1577 as now free from all suspicion in matters of religion, and added to the York High Commission. His neighbour and relation, Sir William Bellasis of Newburgh, had emerged from a suspect youth to a reputation for Protestantism as early as 1569. Both families had recusants amongst the younger sons. Between 1578 and 1582 York officials, parsons, Church-papists and recusants mingled as guests at Gilling Castle. At Malton a dozen recusants and non-communicants emerged—chiefly lesser gentry like the Raysings and Yowards, at Hovingham George Holtby, gent.—brother of the seminary priest—and his family, at Helmsley three non-communicants, including Mr Layton of Sproxton and his wife, at Nunnington Robert Ealand, Esq., and his family, and at Stonegrave a small nest of gentry—William Wright, gent., of Laysthorpe and family, James Butler, gent., William Thornton of East Newton, Esq., and Edward Thornton, gent. The treatment they received was standard; the old and small fry were ignored or left to the Archdeacon, those who seemed willing to conform or certified conformity—the great majority—were quickly let go; the obstinate—here only Mrs Wright of Laysthorpe and two or three other wives—were gaoled or conferred with, with no result.

Birdforth recusancy followed the same pattern. Roger Meynell of Hawnby and his family 'yielded all conformity' at once—which was far from being the end of their course in recusancy. Thomas Talbot, gent., of South Otterington did the same—within twenty years his family was to produce a martyr. Gilbert Metcalfe, gent., of Hood Grange, Kilburn, escaped the Commission's attention apparently—though the Archbishop's visitors received a presentment of him as a recusant. Francis Fulthorpe, gent., an obstinate recusant, beggared by his family's attainder, flitted as a vagrant between Hawnby and Thirsk and

was not caught. John Greene, gent., and his family of Topcliffe professed a desire to conform but sent no certificate. He was a pardoned rebel. William Harrington, gent., of Mount St John was unnoticed by the presenting jury, sheltered Campion and was gaoled in London in 1581. He was remitted to the York Assizes and it seems clear that he must have conformed. But his family remained at the Mount as very covert Catholics in touch with seminary priests for the next twenty years.

The first few presentments now came from Pickering Lythe—Sir Richard Cholmley of Roxby and his son Roger with their families and two non-communicants at Wykeham. All soon conformed, except Lady Cholmley and Elizabeth Harton of Wykeham, who were not now further molested. Those presented in Allertonshire offered as little trouble. Lancelot Conyers, gent., and his wife of Hutton Bonville—relations of Cardinal Allen and the first of their later obstinately recusant family to be presented—at once conformed, as did Roger Meynell, Esq., of North Kilvington—the rebel—and his family and John Bussy, gent., a non-communicant of Leake. Only Richard Meynell and a Northallerton woman gave the Commissioners any trouble.

In spite of the wealth of detail in this survey of the 'catch' of 1580-2, any effort to draw general conclusions is hindered by the gaps in our information. We do not know if the Chester High Commission continued to deal with its own cases from Richmondsire after 2 August 1580, how selective the three juries were in their presentments (the West Riding juries were certainly rated for inadequate first returns and made to produce fuller ones), whether they were told to concentrate on gentry and not bother about lesser fry in detail, what sources of local information they used; we do not know how many of those presented had been reconciled to the Catholic Church. Still, it is evident that the overall numbers of recusants must have been very small; that they seem to have consisted overwhelmingly of country gentry, their families and perhaps a very few dependents; that fifty-eight gentry families are represented in the list—out of some 220 then in the Riding, a fact which goes far to explain the authorities' alarm; that the great majority conformed—most

fully—or obtained certificates that they had done so, and conformed with little ado; that over half had been suspects or recusants in the 1560's or 1570's, and well over half were to continue recusants or Church-papists after 1582. But why the 'sudden declining' into recusancy of 1578–80? We can occasionally glimpse some of the factors which were changing muddled and inactive conservative 'mislikers' (or even perhaps some who had once tended towards Protestantism) by degrees into Catholics by personal, explicit choice. There were the surviving Marian 'runagate' priests, reconciled or not, reconcilers or without the necessary faculties; there was the brief first appearance of a seminary priest or two and 'the man of the Mount'; there was the correspondence of the exiles of 1569 and the return home of some like Ingram (and perhaps John) Thwing, John Norton, Leonard Metcalfe, perhaps John Gower before his ordination; there was the circulation of books—medieval and Marian (such as had helped Thomas Bell and Michael Tirry) or from the exiles in Louvain or MSS. like Bell's 'book'; there was the influence of Catholic-minded tutors and undergraduate groups at the Universities, at the Inns of Court, and of young men going abroad to finish their education. It remained to be seen what the full impact of the seminary priest and Jesuit mission after 1582 would be on such people.

Notes

(1) Aveling, *The Catholic Recusants of the West Riding*, cit., pp. 192–4; Camden Soc., *Miscell.* ix, pp. 70 ff.

(2) PRO, ASS. 41–7 (Yorks Assize records), has no recusancy presentments of the sixteenth century, but the practice then is shown by YAJ, xvi, p. 141.

(3) F. Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, 1779, pp. 88–9.

(4) P. Tyler, *The Ecclesiastical Commission and Catholicism*, 1562–77, Leeds, 1960.

(5) YAJ, xiv, pp. 390 ff.; H. Birt, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement*, pp. 157ff.; Peck, op. cit.; BI, H.C., 1561–4, ff. 169, 186; YCA,

E. 51, ff. 74, 142 (Hebblethwaite); Chester Cty Rec. Office, Chester Dioc. High Comm. Bks., 1562-73.

(6) Reid, *The Council of the North*; MT, *passim*.

(7) CRS, liii, pp. 291ff.

(8) VCHNR; STA, Box I, Common Hall; YCA, House Bks.; Hill, *Tudor and Stuart Lincoln*, p. 99.

(9) VCHNR; G. Young, *History of Whitby*, 1817, ii, pp. 584ff.; YAJ, xvi, p. 141.

(10) Churchwardens' Accts.—Fisher, *History of Masham*, pp. 580ff.; YAJ, xxxvi, pp. 178ff. (Sheriff Hutton); BI, R. VII, G. 608 (Easingwold); Chester Dioc. High Comm. Bks., cit., 28 June 1569 (Manfield).

(11) BI, H.C. and Visitation Bks., *passim*.

(12) Fisher, *op. cit.*; BI, H.C., 1569-70, f. 147 (Richmond).

(13) VCHNR; H. McCall, *Richmondshire Churches*; C. Oman, *English Church Plate*.

(14) BI, H.C., 1569-90, *passim*.

(15) PRO, SP. 12/10 (1559 visitation); Thompson—CSPD, Add. 1547-65, pp. 521ff.; YAJ, vii, pp. 410ff.; information from Bruges MSS (St Hugh's Charterhouse, Parkminster).

(16) Salvin—BI, Institution Book, 1553-71, H.C., 1571-4, ff. 52, 141v., 149v.; Wills, xxi, f. 22. Hanson—Bridgwater, *Concertatio Ecclesiae Cath.* (1589); Downside Review, 1916, H. Birt. Oglethorpe—YAJ, xiv, pp. 390ff. Warren—BI, Institn. Bk., 1553-71; H. Birt, *Elizabethan Religious Settlement*, pp. 149ff.

(17) Aveling, *Catholic Recusants of the W. Riding*, cit., pp. 197ff.; YCA, House Bk., B. xxiv, f. 196 (1570 Oath); 13 *Eliz. cap.* 2; BI, Institn. Bk., 1553-71 (1559ff. subscriptions); H.C., *passim*.

(18) BI, Visitn. Bks., *passim*. White—H.C., *passim*; Venn, *Reg. of Caius College*, pp. 73-4, 86; SS, xxi, pp. 181ff. In June 1561 a Geo. White, priest was Master of Pursglove's new Grammar School at Guisborough (Guisborough Grammar School Muniments; Constitutions).

(19) BI, R. VI. A/3, ff. 61, 191; Institn. Bk., cit.

(20) Ulvason—Frere, *Marian Reaction*, p. 271; SS, clxi, no. 311; BI, H.C., 1568-9, f. 112; *ibid.*, 1569-70, *passim*. Beckwith—*ibid.*, 1571-4, ff. 19, 47v.; YAJ, iv, pp. 390ff.

(21) Firbank—BI, R. VII.G. 1599; Douai, Librairie Municipale, Legatine Reg. of Cardinal Pole, iv, f. 108; CRS, v, p. 193. Gargett—BI, H.C., 1569-70, f. 99; R. VI. A/7; CRS, v, p. 193. Bell—BI, R. VII.

G. 916; H.C., 1571-2, f.180v.; 1572-4, ff.39ff.; 1574-6, f.242; DD, p. 100; CSPD, 1566-79, p. 362.

(22) Wallock—*BI*, H.C., 1569-70, ff.113ff.; R. H/10. Tirry—H.C., 1569-70, ff.68v., 123v.; 1571-4, f.29; R. VII. G. 1781 (examination); H.C., 1576-80, f.63; Foley, iii, p. 241.

(23) *BI*, H.C., 1569-70, *passim*; Aveling, *Cath. Recusants of W. Riding*, cit.

(24) *BI*, R. VII. G. 1599; *YAJ*, xiv, pp. 390ff.; *BI*, H.C., 1571-2, ff.110v. ff.; R. VI. A/7.

(25) Blackburne—*PRO*, SP. 12/201. Orton—*BI*, H.C., 1572-4, 1574-6, 1576-80, *passim*.

(26) Wilkinson—*YAJ*, xiv, p. 390. Robinson—*BI*, Chancery Bk., 1574-9, f.55. Poole—H.C., 1585-91, f.357v., 1596-9, f.286. Lodge—H.C., 1591-5, f.114v.; *CRS*, xxxvii, p. 93. Cuthbert—*CRS*, liii, p. 91.

(27) *BI*, Institn. Bk., 1553-71, iii, f.55.

(28) R. Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts*, 1560-1642, p. 19; *BI*, R. H/26ff. (1571).

(29) Fugall, Smith—Purvis, *Tudor Parish Documents of the Diocese of York*, pp. 203ff. Dalton—*BI*, H.C., 1561-4, f.114. A Robert Dalton was deprived of a Durham prebend in 1560, accounted by Bridgewater, op, cit., a Catholic, and probably chaplain to the fifth Earl of Westmorland in 1563 (H. J. Swallow, *De Nova Villa*, pp. 65-6). Salven, Atkinson—Aveling, *Cath. Recusants of the W. Riding*, cit., pp. 199, 206-7.

(30) Todd—*SS*, clxi; C. Ingledew, *History . . . of Northallerton*, 1858, p. 174; Strype, *Annals*, I, i, pp. 489ff., 504, 512; *BI*, H.C., 1564-8, *passim*. Grene—*BI*, R. VI. A/2, f.114; H.C., 1568-9, f.12v.; Institn Bk., 1553-71, *Archiepisc. Reg.*, xxx. Pala—*BI*, R. VI. A/1, f.89v.

(31) *RH*, ii, 2, p. 142; Knox, *Memorials of Cardinal Allen*, proves that he was not ordained priest until 1565.

(32) Venerable Sexcentenary Issue, *The English Hospice in Rome*, 1962, pp. 220ff.; *BI*, R. VII. G. 1599; Strype, *Annals*, 2, i, pp. 577ff.; C. Sharp, *Memorials of the Rising of 1569*.

(33) *DNB*; Frere, op. cit., pp. 96ff.; *PRO*, SP 12/10; Cal. Patent Rolls, 1560-3, p. 83; CSPD, Add. 1547-65, pp. 521ff.; *BI*, H.C., 1566-8, f.4.

(34) Cal. Patent Rolls, 1558-9, p. 138ff.; *YASRS*, 2, pp. 164, 298, 309ff., 325; *VCHNR*, (Ugthorpe).

(35) *HMC, 9th Report*, i, App., pp. 348-9; Gillow, *Biog. Dict. of Eng. Catholics*, iv, pp. 117ff.; Simpson, *Life of Campion*, pp. 131, 191; C. G. Bayne, *Anglo-Roman Relations*, App. xliii, p. 289. Guisborough Grammar School MSS (City Rec. Office, Northallerton), Constitutions—Pursglove appoints as master George White clerk (most likely the fugitive master from Newburgh) and a Catholic, Roger Tocketts of Tocketts, Esq., as one of the two guardians.

(36) *Nattres*—*BI*, R. VII. G. 1599; W. T. Mellows, *The Last Days of Peterborough Monastery*; N. I. Longden, *Northants. and Rutland Clergy from 1500*. *Bovell*—*BI*, R. VII. G. 1599; *Instittn. Bk.*, 1553-71; *Bridgewater*, op. cit. *Salvin*—*CSPD*, Add. 1547-65, pp. 521ff.; J. Foster, *Alumni Oxon.*; *SS*, clxi, *passim*. *Carter*—*CSPD*, cit.; *SS*, cxxi, no. 366; *DD*, p. 5; *SS*, xxvi, p. 204. *Sedgwick*—*Strype*, *Cranmer*, pp. 290ff., *Memorials*, 3, i, p. 570; *SS*, xxvi, *passim*; *CRS*, v, p. 193; *BI*, H.C., 1570-2, *passim*; *CSPD*, 1566-79, p. 223.

(37) *Copley*—*Sharp*, op. cit., pp. 189ff.; *BI*, R. VII. G. 1599; *Wills*, xix, f.565v.; R. VII. G. 897; *Marshall*—*Foster*, op. cit.; *CSPD*, Add. 1547-65, cit.

(38) *BI*, H.C., *passim*; R. H/10, *Visitn. Bks.*, *passim*.

(39) *RH*, 2, ii, p. 142; *BI*, *Chancery Bk.*, 1606-10, ff.80ff.; H.C., 1591-5, f.122v., 1607-12, f.89; *NRRO*, *Meynell MSS*, T. Meynell's Book and Quarter Sess. *Recusants*, 1611.

(40) *Stapper*—*MT*, iii, p. 145; *BI*, R. H/10, *Chancery Bk.*, 1613-18, f.76v.; *Westminster Archives*, *Old Brotherhood MSS*, i, f.26; *University College, Oxford*, *Bursars' Accounts and Coll. Reg.* *Mudd*—*Foley*, iii, p. 240; *MT*, iii, p. 233; *BI*, H.C., 1580-5, ff.3ff.

(41) *Frere*, op. cit., p. 261; *BI*, H.C., 1568-9, ff.172v. ff. *Rydeall*, *Raynes*—*Aveling*, op. cit.

(42) *Bolton*—*MT*, iii, p. 233; *CRS*, v, p. 193; *BI*, R. VII. G. 1599; H.C., 1576-9, f.63. *White*, *Myers*, *Boyce*—R. VII. G. 1599. *Taylor*—*PRO*, SP. 12/175; *CRS*, 53/189ff. *Atkinson*—H.C., 1569-70, *passim*; *PRO*, SP. 15/32. *Oglethorpe*—H.C., 1591-5, f.122v. *Smith*—*Aveling*, op. cit., p. 201. *Wilkinson*—*MT*, iii, pp. 233ff.; *CRS*, v, p. 193; H.C., 1572-4, *passim*. *Sir William*—*CSPF*, 1562, pp. 12-13, 23, 167. *Walker*—*CRS*, ii, pp. 223ff.

(43) *Betson*—H.C., 1561-4, ff.98, 112. *Hutchinson*—*BI*, R. As. 4/21.

(44) *BI*, H.C., *passim*.

(45) *Ibid*.

(46) *BI*, *Wills*; *ARP*, RD/RP, 6; *BI*, *Archiep. Register*, xxx, *passim*.

Neville had been Marian Archdeacon of Carlisle and chaplain to Queen Mary (*DNB*).

(47) Knox, *Memorials of Cardinal Allen*, cit.; *CSPF*, 1560-1, p. 564, 1561-2, p. 37 (Rutland); Aveling, op. cit., p. 205 (Gargrave, Young).

(48) *CRS*, v, pp. 38, 51, 126.

(49) Sharp, op. cit.; *CSPF*, 1562, p. 204.

(50) *DD*, *passim*; Nelson, Beseleys—*VCHNR*(Overton); *BI*, Wills, xvi, p. 97; xvii, p. 311; Knox, *Memorials*, cit. Blackburne—*PRO*, SP. 12/201.

(51) Kirby—*DD*; *CRS*, liii, p. 209; *Lives of Eng. Martyrs*, ed. Camm, ii, pp. 500ff. Holtby—Foley, iii, *passim*; *BI* Wills, xvii, f.37v.; Venn, op. cit., p. 75. Rishton—Camm, op. cit., ii, p. 445; *CRS*, liii, p. 209; xxxvii, p. 9; Burton and Pollen, *Lives of Eng. Martyrs*, i, p. 162; Downside Review, 1916, p. 80.

(52) Clarkson, *History of Richmond*, 1821, pp. 381, 416-17 (in error in saying he married); *VCHNR*; *CSPD*, 1566-79, pp. 456-8; Knox, *Memorials*, cit.; *CSPF*, 1580, *passim*; Foley, *Pilgrim Book*, pp. 557, 560; *Eng. Hospice*, cit., pp. 232ff.

(53) *DD*; Knox, op. cit.; *CRS*, xiii, p. 103; liii, p. 209.

(54) R. Simpson, *Life of Campion*; *APC*, 1581-2, pp. 267, 282; *PRO*, SP. 12/245 (Harrington); SP. 12/157 (intercepted letter); *HMC*, Salisbury MSS, ix, p. 153 (traces of the visit).

(55) *VCHNR*; Aveling, op. cit., p. 218; Rokeby—*APC*, 1581-2, pp. 267, 282; *BI*, H.C., 1574-6, f.77; J. Foster, *Visitations of Yorkshire*, 1584-5, pp. 388ff.; *CRS*, ii, pp. 223, 228, 234. Cleasby—*BI*, Wills, xxiii, f.233; Sharp, op. cit., *passim*.

(56) Percy—*SS*, clxiii, Introd.; cxxxiv, pp. 96ff.; *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 1956, pp. 48ff.; *CSPD*, 1566-79, pp. 288ff. (Topcliffe); *YAJ*, xvii, pp. 128ff. Dacre—*VCHNR*.

(57) *Ibid.*; G. E. Cockayne, *Complete Peerage*, *passim*.

(58) *Ibid.*; W. Trimble, *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England*, 1964, pp. 16, 34 (Dacre); Sharp.

(59) *Ibid.*, pp. 75-6.

(60) Lennox—*DNB*; Sharp, op. cit., p. 189; Swallow, op. cit. (Westmorlands); *SS*, lxviii, Introd. (Dacres). Latimer—*BI*, H.C., 1561-4, ff.22ff.; *Proc. of Suffolk Inst. of Archaeol.*, XXVIII, Part iii (1961). McGrath and Rowe, *The Recusancy of Sir Thomas Cornwallis*.

(61) Sharp, *passim*; *SS*, cxxxiv, pp. 96ff.; *CSPD*, 1566-79, p. 174; *PRO*, E.137/133/1 (fines on rebels); *ibid.*, C.1066/585ff. (pardons to rebels); *CSPD*, Add. 1580-1625, pp. 5, 11 (state of Richmondshire).

(62) J. Foster, *op. cit.*; J. T. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry on the Eve of Civil War* (London Ph.D. thesis).

(63) PRO, SP. 15/21 (Gargrave); CRS, lvi, pp. ixff.

(64) Cholmley—*Memoirs of Sir Hugh Cholmley* (privately printed, 1787); YASRS, xcvi, pp. 17ff. Danby—J. Fisher, *op. cit.*, pp. 103ff.; YASRS, xcvi, pp. 14ff.; CSPD, 1566–79, p. 181; Danby MSS, in Cunliffe-Lister Muniments, Cartwright Hall, Bradford.

(65) Fairfax—RH (Biog. Studies), 3, ii, et seq. Meynell—CRS, lvi, *cit.*

(66) CSPD, *passim*; PRO, SP. 12/72 (Grindal). Holme—A. G. Dickens, *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York, 1509–58*, pp. 114ff.; BI, H.C., 1576–80, f.123ff.

(67) Gower—DNB; C. H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p. 165; Camden Soc., *Miscell. ix*, pp. 70ff. (1564); PRO, SP. 15/21 (1572); CRS, xxii, pp. 12ff. (parents). Uvedale—Dickens, *op. cit.*, p. 120; PRO, SP. 15/21. Universities—J. Venn, *Early Collegiate Life, 1913*, pp. 80ff.; Purvis, *op. cit.*, pp. 109ff.

(68) Lepton, etc.—BI, H.C., 1561–4, ff.23, 144. Durham—CSPF, 1561–2, p. 225. 1562—Cal. Patent Rolls, 1560–3, pp. 436–7. Young—Camden Soc., *cit.* Tankard—T. Lawson-Tancred, *The Tancreds of Brampton, Leeds, 1921*. Lascelles—BI, H.C., 1561–4, ff.14v. ff.; YCA, House Bk., 1560–5, f.60v.; Sharp, *op. cit.*; CSPD, 1566–79, p. 196; PRO, SP. 15/28c (prognostications).

(69) BI, Wills, xvi, et seq.; SS, cxxvi, *passim*.

(70) Sharp, *op. cit.*; refs. in Note (63) *supra*.

(71) VCHNR; SS, lxviii, pp. xiff.

(72) NRRO, Meynell MSS, Sowerby papers; Sharp, *op. cit.*, pp. 224ff. (Cleasby); CSPD, 1566–79, pp. 288ff. (Lascelles); *Downside Review*, 1916, pp. 70ff. (exiles); APC, 1581–2, p. 67; CSPD, 1581–90, p. 276, 1591–4, p. 211 (Thwing); W.C. and G. Metcalfe, *Metcalfe Records, 1891*, pp. 115ff.

(73) C. G. Bayne, *op. cit.*; J. Venn, *op. cit.*, pp. 80ff.

(74) BI, H.C. and Visitn. Bks., *passim*.

(75) *Ibid.*; Stonyhurst MSS Anglia, i, 3ff., 16ff.

(76) BI, H.C. and Visitn. Bks., *passim*.

(77) House Bks., *passim*; HMC, Var. Coll. Wombwell MSS, pp. 94–5.

(78) CSPD, Add. 1580–1625; BI, H.C., 1580–5, *passim*; PRO, SP. 12/141 (Richmond).

The Heroic Years of Catholic Recusancy, 1583-1603

WE NOW pass into that period of English Catholic local history which is most familiar to the average reader, the classical age of martyrdoms, of the full seminary priest and Jesuit missions, of plots and hiding-holes, of Walsingham and Topcliffe. As a consequence, in trying to survey North Riding recusancy during these years, we have to struggle resolutely to steer a course clear of both a Scylla and a Charybdis—a Scylla which is unconscious romancing, exaggerating the numbers of recusants and ‘schismatics’, exaggerating the effectiveness and ferocity of the persecution, giving an over-idealistic picture of the missionaries and their organisation, of the average recusant; a Charybdis, nowadays especially just as illusory, consisting of a strong reaction from romanticism into a positivistic ultra-scepticism.

The first feature of this period was the further development of the system of government repression of Catholicism under the Earl of Huntingdon (died in office as President, December 1595), and its decline under his successors, Archbishop Hutton (1595–9) and the second Lord Burghley (1599–1603). It is not easy to assess Huntingdon’s success as an administrator. During his career, Christopher Rokeby of Mortham accused him of favouritism. After his death his Puritan admirers, while praising him for his sincere piety, admitted that he was very ‘raw’ in his earlier years at York and always over-credulous in his dealings with others. Zealous as he was, he was only the local administrator of

policies—and even details—decided at Westminster. The main additions to the system of repression in his day—the organisation of much higher financial levies on recusants, the laying of the basis of a code of penal laws, the creation of the royal Commissions against Jesuits and seminary priests—owed very little in origin to him and his part in their execution was a subordinate one.⁽¹⁾ Again, for both Westminster and Huntingdon, religious policy, however vital, was only one segment of the whole business of government. The time of the President was mostly spent on a multiplicity of secular concerns, civil suits in the Council of the North, military matters, policy towards Scotland, trade and industrial matters, the maintenance of order. Even within the segment of religious policy, repression of Catholicism, however absorbing and important, was only one of several aims. In 1578 Huntingdon ended a letter with a sentence which expresses those aims—‘God make us pure in hys syghte thorrowe Chryste, and confounde all poperye and counterfayte gospellynge’. The outlook he shared with the Protestant officials is expressed vividly in a Latin letter from Archbishop Sandys to the Bishop of Durham in 1583. The main enemy was ‘impietas hujus perditioni seculi’; how widely does wickedness rule, how innumerable are the perverse and reprobate, the wilfully indifferent, the libertines, the unstable, the materialists; ‘quam exilis, quam arida, vel potius quam nulla, sit in terra fides, nulla pietas’. Of all this, superstition, idolatry and heresy were only partial manifestations; the Pope was not the main Antichrist. Indeed, in those days, for both ardent Protestants and Catholics alike, for the priest Cumberford meditating constantly on the Book of Daniel, for Cardinal Allen, Sander, Grindal, Sandys, and Huntingdon, the signs of the Last Days were plainly evident. Hence for Sandys and Huntingdon, ‘libidinem comprimi, scelus constringi, dissolutos mores contineri . . . severis legibus et dignis supplicibus coerceri’, to strive to increase the number of good Protestant pastors and preachers, to suppress antinomian and sectarian Puritanism (still apparently very rare in the county), all bulked quite as large in their minds as the suppression of popery. For religious reasons, as well as political ones, these authorities were

in two minds about religious persecution. Sandys' own justification of it is defensive and political—because the Papists do it ('est misericordia crudelis: et cur non cogeret ecclesia perditos filios ut redirent, si perditii filii cogerunt alios ut perirent?'), and because 'qui perfidi sunt in Deum, in principem fideles esse non possunt'. Huntingdon seems to have agreed with him. In conference with a captured priest, Alexander Rawlins, he insisted that he and the State had no desire to molest priests as priests, but only accidentally, as traitors. Hutton, then Dean of York and later Archbishop, and himself in some ways a more extreme Puritan than either Sandys or Huntingdon, did not quite agree with this. In his celebrated and bitter quarrel with Sandys in 1585, he ostentatiously did not deny the Archbishop's furious charge that, in dealing with recusants (Hutton was frequently called on to confer with them), he was mild, principally sought peace and actually had secretly warned some Catholics in advance of official attacks being prepared against them. (Still more interesting is the implication that the York officials were wont to discuss what they would do if the régime fell and Catholicism returned to power—Hutton was reputed to have said he would simply retire into lay life.) We can compare with this Whitgift's condemnation of the attempt to force recusants against their consciences to attend Protestant sermons. Indeed there seems to be abundant evidence that, apart from periods of panic, like 1588 and the days after the chief plots, official policy towards recusants was something much more complex than simple, brutal extermination. It is impossible now to disentangle the various factors impinging on the official mind—the pressures of factions at the Council table, concern for public opinion, the pressure of family ties or of gentry 'trades-unionism', concern for repercussions abroad, the administrator's realistic acceptance of facts (Huntingdon must—at least by 1583—have accepted with part of his mind the fact that no amount of the repression methods then possible could ever blot out Catholicism; there are phrases in his letters implying even that he had a tacit gentleman's agreement with the moderate and 'quiet' papist leaders, 'the Lady-Matins lot', to live and let live), religious

scruples, desire to leave open an escape route in case the Queen died and 'the world changed'.⁽²⁾

Also, impressive though the repressive system looked, its actual working was sluggish and only very partially effective for many solid reasons. A major reason was its dependence on the co-operation of the local gentry, with all their *esprit de corps*, infinitely interlocking family ties, connections with Court groups, allergy towards career officials brought in from outside, all their internal rivalries and feuds. The very choice and fate of Presidents illustrates this. The Privy Council—its own factions' pressures apart—found the choice unbearably hard. To choose a peer with power in Yorkshire was to invite faction and favouritism; to choose an outsider official, like the Archbishop (they were twice driven to this, Young and Hutton), led at once to massive discontent amongst the gentry, as Hutton admitted in anguish; to choose peers who were outsiders (the most common expedient, Shrewsbury, Rutland, Sussex, Huntingdon, Burghley) offered least objections, but was still resented. Huntingdon, with his place in the succession to the throne, his royal and Pole ancestry, his Catholic relations and yet very safe personal Protestantism, was the most successful choice. Yet there are signs that he was resented. Christopher Rokeby of Mortham wrote to Cecil that Huntingdon was full of favouritism and that the gentry would much prefer as referee of their private feuds a 'natural pillar' like the Earl of Northumberland. After his death, Huntingdon's warmest admirers admitted that he began his career at York very 'raw' and was always much too 'credulous' in his dealings with others. The composition of the Council of the North was also a difficulty. Gargrave in 1572 had pointed out that Yorkshire contained a multitude of poor and unlearned gentry but comparatively few qualified by wealth and skill to be Councillors. If the Privy Council and Huntingdon further limited their choice by rigid adherence to their ruling to exclude recusants and those with recusant wives or close relations, they would be left with almost no choice at all. In practice, therefore, it was usual to include suspects and bear with them, hoping thereby to hold them to conformity until it became second nature. The

small list of North Riding Councillors lacks, therefore, men like the Danbys, Darcys, Sayers, Lawsons, Scropes of Danby, Bulmers, Metcalfes, Pudseys, Wycliffes, Salvins of Newbiggin (who, at any other time would certainly have sat on the Council), but includes amongst the eight chosen six who were certainly not free of all suspicion. Amongst the six were the peers, Scrope and Eure. Default of male heirs and attainder had temporarily almost emptied the top of the social pyramid of the Riding. The eighth and ninth Earls of Northumberland were both put in the Tower on suspicion of complicity in Catholic plots and both kept out of the north. The Conyers, Latimer and Dacre powers were in abeyance. Lord Wharton was still suspect and a stranger to the Riding; the new Earls of Rutland and Derby, though Protestant, made little impact there. No new peers had taken root in the Riding. The Bowes and Cecil families had taken advantage of the great turnover of lands after 1569 to acquire considerable holdings, but the Bowes had no peerage and were half a Durham family still, while Lord Burghley showed no disposition to nurse his power in the Riding from his new house (ex-Latimer) of Snape. Huntingdon also made no move to acquire land in the county and his house at Sheriff Hutton was official Crown property. In this new vacuum of nobility, Scrope and Eure stood out in lonely and embarrassing eminence. There is no reason to doubt their personal Protestantism, yet there are signs that a certain tension existed between them and Huntingdon. Both considered it necessary periodically to make elaborate professions of loyalty. Scrope's mother—now married to Sir Richard Cholmley—was a definite papist; his second wife was a Howard, related to many suspects; two of his sisters, Lady Constable of Burton Constable and Mrs Thomas Pudsey of Barforth, were Catholics. His heir, Thomas Scrope, though knighted in 1585 and an M.P., was kept employed by his father on the Western Marches and did not appear on the Council of the North until after his succession to the title in 1592. Eure's position was fairly similar. His heir, Ralph Eure, when on the grand tour of Europe in 1582, had caused Cecil much anxiety by disobeying a command not to enter Italy. Nevertheless by 1586 he was safely home and on the North

Riding Bench—though he had married into the Dawneys of Sessay and Cowick, who had Catholic connections.⁽³⁾

Also amongst the six Councillors was Sir William Fairfax of Gilling. Though immensely engaged in official business for the Council, Parliament, the High Commission and the Bench, Fairfax was not to turn out the satisfactory convert from popery which Huntingdon had thought him in 1577. By 1590 three of his brothers and their families were becoming recusants, and in 1594 he married his only son to a Catholic wife. Sir Christopher Wandesford, on the other hand, seems to be an example of a convert whom Huntingdon held. His family had hitherto shown all the signs of strong Catholic tendencies, and a cadet branch was later to be Catholic, but from him the main family started a tradition of strong Protestantism. Two other Councillors were Rokebys of Mortham, and close relations of John Rokeby, the shelterer of Campion. Lastly, in 1599 there were added to the Council two others with close Catholic connections, Sir Thomas Lascelles of Brakenbrough (most of the rest of whose family were Catholics) and Sir Thomas Fairfax of Gilling (then still reputed to favour Catholicism, and with a definitely recusant wife and sons who were to be educated in Catholic schools abroad).⁽⁴⁾

A good many changes were made in the North Riding Commission of the Peace in this period. In 1587 Archbishop Sandys commented bitterly on all the chopping and changing, which he thought influenced more by faction than principle. He had little good to say of existing members of the Bench, or of the gentry in general—but he had fallen foul of their factions. In 1583 of twenty-four active Justices, at least nine or ten had close Catholic connections. So, for instance, there was Thomas Grimston (who must surely be the shelterer of Campion, now conformed), Henry Scrope (who had a recusant wife at his death in 1590 and himself sheltered recusants), John Sayer of Worsall (of an otherwise strongly Catholic family), Sir Thomas Danby of Masham (a highly suspect conformist, who died in 1590), Marmaduke Wyvill of Constable Burton (the son of a strong recusant, himself a rebel as a boy in 1569, a recusant in 1571 but now reclaimed and set on his way towards a baronetcy, though his wife was to

become a recusant and his heir to marry one), Francis Cholmley (the heir of Sir Richard of Whitby, a member of a family of whom the other chief members were about to emerge as strong recusants, and himself to die young in 1586, leaving a will with a Catholic preamble) and Roger Radcliffe senior of Mulgrave (consistently regarded as a Protestant, but his estates already considerable recusant strongholds and most of his family Catholic). By 1585 the Bench had undergone changes, but it still contained its leaven of suspects—Wyvill, Sir William Bellasis of Newburgh and his son Henry (of a family with close Catholic connections), Richard Darley of Buttercrambe (his wife an obstinate non-communicant in 1586, and the family not yet the extreme Puritans they were to be after 1600), Radcliffe, Robert Rokeby of Marske in Cleveland (married to a Durham wife with strong Catholic connections; their children to be recusants after his death), Sir John Dawney of Sessay (with a Tunstall of Scargill wife much related to recusants, and himself with Catholic Dawney relations). Between 1595 and 1601 the whole county administration, and particularly the North Riding, went through a phase of instability. The causes are very obscure, though undoubtedly strong factors were the accumulated discontent of excluded gentry, exacerbated by the death of Huntingdon and the succession to the Presidency of Archbishop Hutton (which gave the York administration a still more official and 'non-gentry' appearance, and probably touched hidden springs of anti-clericalism), and the rise of the Earl of Essex, promising a new deal and vague hopes of a more tolerant religious policy. In 1594-7 at least four North Riding Justices (Sir William Fairfax and Sir John Dawney, with papist affiliations, and William Mauleverer and William Hildyard, men with strong Puritan backgrounds) banded together to obstruct Council of the North business. In 1597 there was a passionately disputed election for the county seats in Parliament, in which Sir William Fairfax of Gilling again took the side of an opposition to the Council of the North—of which, of course, he himself was a prominent member. As he lay dying that same year he was punished by being deprived of the lucrative stewardship of the St Mary's York

abbey lands, held for two generations by his family. It is a notable fact that Fairfax defeated in the election a Council candidate, Sir John Stanhope, who, though apparently not resident in Yorkshire, and a holder of offices at Court, was a Councillor of the North and Custos Rotulorum of the North Riding. This adds point to the suggestion that Fairfax and his allies were hotly opposed to the monopolisation of chief power in the Riding and county by officials and outsiders. Also in 1597 there began the tempestuous career in litigation and trouble-making of Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby of Hackness. By a curious coincidence three newcomers of like character—most extreme Puritans, indefatigable litigants, would-be reformers of their neighbours—settled, each in a quite strongly recusant area of Yorkshire, in the last years of Queen Elizabeth's reign. They were Hoby, Sir Stephen Proctor of Fountains and Sir Timothy Whittingham. Hoby was extremely well-connected. His father was Sir Thomas Hoby of Bisham in Berkshire, a distinguished diplomat, and his mother Elizabeth Cooke, a great Puritan and sister-in-law of the first Lord Burghley and of Sir Nicholas Bacon. Lady Hoby later remarried to a Russell—that is, into the very centre of Puritan high society. Thomas Posthumous Hoby entered the Riding in 1596 when he married Mrs Margaret Sidney, a much married lady with many great Puritan connections, and the owner of Hackness. It is not surprising that Hoby was soon on the North Riding Bench, and by 1603 on the Council of the North and East Riding Bench also. He had an infinite and religious capacity for minute detail, which—together with his influential connections—eventually made him Custos Rotulorum of the North Riding. But it also, together with his alien origins and his aggressive Puritanism and incessant litigiousness, inevitably made him much disliked by the generality of country gentry. In the 1597 county election he and Stanhope had joined as Council (defeated) candidates. He had also seen fit to accuse the West Riding gentry who formed the bulk of the opposition there of usury and commercial dishonesty—a favourite Puritan theme, to which, as Archbishop Sandys had discovered to his cost, the gentry were allergic. Hoby then applied to the bailiffs of

Scarborough for election to one of their Parliamentary seats—of the two, one went automatically to the Lord High Admiral's choice, the other apparently by agreement between the Council of the North and any interested local grandees. The new Lord Eure was interested in this seat, but then preoccupied on the Marches, and Hoby duly obtained it. This may have had something to do with a furious row which now began between Hoby and the Eure family, with whom were associated the Cholmleys of Whitby. The battle was carried by Hoby into the Star Chamber in 1601 and became a long campaign over the years down to at least 1612-3. It began with a visit to Hoby's house at Hackness in August 1600 of a hunting party containing Sir William Eure, William Eure, William Dawney, William Hildyard junior and Richard Cholmley, the heir of Whitby, where Hoby rebuked his guests for gambling, swearing and lascivious talk, and they retorted by drowning the family evening psalmody with their songs and ribald imitations. Behind this lay resentment of Hoby as 'the busiest saucy little Jack in all the country and would have an oar in anybody's boat', an alien interloper 'who came over the water with his coach and three horses but all scant worth sixpence'; and behind that, quarrels between the Eures and Hoby over land at Malton (and probably the free seat at Scarborough), and between Hoby and the Cholmleys over the ownership of the liberty jurisdiction of Whitby Strand (which the Cholmleys claimed to have bought with the estate, but which Hoby was going to claim as still the Crown's and soon to be his by a new grant).⁽⁵⁾

On top of all this came the Essex affair. By 1599 Essex was clearly behind decisions by the Privy Council to send an imprisoned Jesuit, Thomas Wright, and several Appellant seminary priest prisoners from Wisbech Castle, into Yorkshire to hasten on an agreement between Catholics and the government over allegiance. Hopes of a new policy of toleration must have been high amongst Yorkshire Catholic gentry—and perhaps some extreme Puritans. The York officials viewed this turn of events with alarm and pinned their hopes on the Cecil party. In 1599 the Cecils secured a considerable victory in the appointment of

the second Lord Burghley to succeed Hutton as President, and Burghley at once launched a new and formidable drive against recusants in the county. There followed the 'revolt' of Essex and his friends. In fact no recusant Yorkshire gentry were involved in the revolt; Richard Cholmley of Whitby was the only North Riding man imprisoned and fined for a direct part in it, and he was only a 'crypto-papist'. Hoby did his best to exploit this fact, and also the fall of Sir William Eure, Lord Eure's brother, who had been imprisoned in 1600 on suspicion of treacherous correspondence with the King of Scots. It is possible that Sir William Eure was also attached to Essex's party. There is also some rather dubious evidence of a connection between the Essex party and the Danbys of Masham and Fairfaxes of Gilling. However, in July 1601 Lord Burghley was reporting that the Yorkshire papists were loudly pointing to the evident fact that they had, as a body, dissociated themselves from Essex's revolt and hoping that this might be a further reason for granting them toleration.⁽⁶⁾

When we look through this evidence of unrest during the years 1595-1601, it seems clear that Catholicism was only accidentally and occasionally connected with it. There is no clear evidence that the rebel Justices of 1595-7 or the electoral opposition of 1597 had any particular religious motive. Indeed, so prominent a crypto-papist as Sir Henry Constable of Burton Constable supported Hoby and Stanhope at the election. It is true that Hoby, in his great suits with the Eures and Cholmleys, was to charge both with popish sympathies—with a certain small amount of justification. But that was not Hoby's real accusation and he showed, throughout his litigation, a strong tendency to charge all his opponents (of whatever religious background) with that offence.

At the end of this period, in 1603, the North Riding Bench still had its quota of Justices with Catholic connections. Apart from the perennials (Sir Thomas Lascelles, Sir Thomas Fairfax, Robert Rokeby of Marske and Marmaduke Wyvill), there were now Richard Cholmley of Whitby (restored to favour, but still with Catholic relations and a reputation for sheltering his quite numerous Catholic tenants), Sir Conyers Darcy of Hornby (a

Puritan himself, but the son of a recusant father and with Catholic close relations) and Sir Henry Tankard of Arden (who had a brother a prominent Jesuit.)

The workings of the recusancy fining system also amply illustrate the difficulties faced by Tudor administrators. The basis of this was the shilling fine of *1 Eliz.cap.2* (1559). Collected effectively, this would have been ruinous for determined recusants who were not in easy circumstances, since it applied to the seventy to seventy-seven days a year of obligation in the Anglican calendar, and to every recusant in a household, and was interpreted as applying to 'mislikers' who deliberately came late to service, left early or 'walked and talked' during service. (Also a further clause of the same Statute laid a fine of 100 marks on mislikers who spoke against the Prayer Book service or interrupted the minister.) There seems to be no doubt that it was collected—usually by distraint—spasmodically and very unevenly even as late as the eighteenth century; in corporate towns it was doubled and obstinate recusants disenfranchised. But the duty of collection lay solely on churchwardens, who already had their work cut out to collect poor rates, clerks' wages, Easter dues, and it seems that they frequently neglected the fine unless pushed on by a zealous incumbent, the High Commission or the Council of the North—and there was relatively little effort made in this matter by those authorities. *23 Eliz.cap.1* (1581) imposed also the much more formidable fine of £20 per person for each period of a month of twenty-eight days (four successive Sundays) absence from church without excuse—£260 a year. This was like a new machine which has long to be recalled to the works for repairs and adjustments to meet unforeseen technical faults. The Exchequer records contain a few cases of imposition of the fine in 1582–3, but it met severe difficulties—in particular that the well-to-do determined recusants successfully evaded service of summonses from the Quarter Sessions or Assizes (which were to convict them of recusancy and certify them to the Exchequer so that the sheriff could be authorised to collect the fines), that the bulk of those convicted were defaulters on their half-yearly payments, which imposed on the sheriffs a mountain

of ordinary distraint for debts—and, since many of those caught seem to have been copyholders or people of little means, the proceeds of debt collection would be swallowed up totally in expenses, and the prisons much overcrowded with debtors, who would be a charge on the county. The county was already fully aroused to the increasing problem of pauperism and county collections for poor prisoners were liable to meet no response at all. Thus 29 *Eliz.cap.6* (1586) sought to repair the machine. If the accused recusant dodged service of summons, then service by proclamation only (posting the summons on the parish church door or even sessions house door) with non-appearance in court to conform was to count as refusal to conform and conviction was then to be automatic. Also in cases of default in payment, the Exchequer was to value the property and seize two-thirds of it to the use of the Crown until the recusant died and the debt was paid, or until he conformed. Another clause ingeniously allowed that, of the Crown's proceeds from seizure, a third could go to any informer who had secured the conviction of the recusant (ordinary presentments having failed), and another third to the county poor. The intention of the authorities was still, as far as possible, to impose the fine on poor recusants, and recoup any losses on this out of the seized property of wealthier recusants. It was in these years that the county authorities much increased their gaol accommodation. By 1592 business was brisk enough for the Exchequer to establish a specialist department for recusant fines, with its own receivers, auditors and Recusant Rolls—but that was over a decade after the first statutory imposition of the fine. The local machinery—churchwardens presenting through constables to the Quarter Sessions or Assizes—gradually settled down to a very measured routine. In the North Riding recusant business came to be transacted normally only at one full sessions a year, at Michaelmas, when Justices sat simultaneously at Richmond and at Helmsley, or some other town in the east of the Riding. Presentments were then received and summonses to the accused issued; in each case normally a year then elapsed, and by then the accused had either already certified his conformity (real or occasional), now certified it, or refused (personally, or by non-

appearance) and was indicted and convicted. Constables steadily showed great reluctance to double all this chore by taking recusancy presentments also to the Assizes, and the Judges were apparently forced unwillingly to bear with them. The fining Statutes required the Justices to bind those who had been recusants for a year or more—'obstinate recusants'—in recognisances for 'the good behaviour'. Lambarde, writing on the duties of Justices about this time, observed that the lawyers generally interpreted this as a bond to keep the peace, but he thought it must mean a bond to conform by a fixed date. He noted that most Benches he knew accepted the first interpretation. There are several references in the earliest surviving North Riding Sessions rolls (1605) which might be interpreted to mean that here the second view was taken—but nevertheless it seems that few such bonds were exacted. The Clerk of the Peace then forwarded to the Exchequer the estreats of convicted recusants. The Exchequer early displayed a very sensible desire to sift out from the estreats cases where further proceedings would be most uneconomic—people without freehold lands or property of any notable value. They could not do this without exact valuations. From at least 1595 the Privy Council exacted from churchwardens through the President valuations of the estates of all recusants—convicted or not yet convicted. As one would expect, these valuations vary greatly in quality and, reading between the lines, it is evident that there was an interplay of factors behind the valuations. There were conscientious Protestants, there were churchwardens (as at Thornton-le-Street) who turned a judicious blind eye, and often there must have been the fear that the parish would be loaded with paupers or simply the Tudor 'ganging-up' of a locality against the tax-collector. After all, levies on landlords had a way of being passed on to tenants; impoverished tenants could injure a landlord; the whole community had to carry its poor. (The most striking example of this mentality is surely the practice then—as at Scarborough—of adjusting to a rising population without increasing the tax levy from the community, by adding to the usual 'subsidy-men' 'bearers' with them undercover.) By 1605 the really poor seem to have been

weeded out of the system fairly completely, and the official intention was to use the 1559 shilling fine on them.⁽⁷⁾

The informer system also grew up and, by 1603-5, we hear of several professionals, like James Sysson, yeoman, of Yarm, Richard Heaton, gent., of Wetherby, Thomas Marr and Richard Braithwaite who operated about Thirsk. Heaton certainly specialised in catching recusant gentry and their servants when staying in London. Such Catholics moved around often, knowing they could only be convicted for four successive Sundays' absence from the same church, but could be off their guard in London. The lesser informers no doubt—though it is true there is no evidence of it in the surviving earliest North Riding Quarter Sessions records—tried to lay informations for recusancy and offences against the penal Statutes at Quarter Sessions. Sysson also served as a sheriff's deputy at seizures and was a considerable Crown farmer of seized lands. Heaton dealt in recusants' seized cattle. At this period, at any rate, the informers seem to have been a very doubtful asset to the system. They secured few convictions, pocketed some of the Crown's profit, and were regarded with distaste by the Justices. On the other hand they did harry and discomfort the poorer kind of recusant. In 1599 Catholics round Whitby retaliated by beating Sysson and his companions and chasing them out of the area.

The fining system had other weaknesses, which could be exploited by recusant gentry with adequate legal advice. Once a seizure was ordered, the Exchequer had to rely for valuation on local commissioners, or rather a jury of inquest. What could then happen is amply illustrated from a letter to the Bishop of Durham from his steward in Allertonshire in April 1596. Thomas Meynell of North Kilvington, Thirsk, according to his own account, lived as a Catholic all his life, but evaded conviction as a recusant so long as his father lived, apparently by living as a 'vagrant' with his wife at various relatives' houses in Richmondshire. His father died in 1591 and, as heir, he moved to Kilvington and was very soon convicted of recusancy. He was now compelled—as owner of an estate held in knight service or socage—to sue out his livery from the Crown. By a Statute of 1559 he therefore

faced what was in fact, before 1586, one of the most practically dangerous of penal laws—the obligation to take the Oath of Supremacy before receiving livery. Yet he went to London to the Court of Wards and Liveries and received livery and it is quite certain that he escaped taking the Oath—most probably by bribery of a clerk. By 1596 none of his family had paid a penny of the recusancy fines and the debt must have been nearly £3,400. Seizure was ordered. The Allertonshire steward in much detail described what happened. The three Commissioners appointed by the Exchequer were John Constable of Dromonby, William Mauleverer (both Justices) and Talbot Bowes. The steward had chosen a jury of inquest and gave the list to the sheriff's deputy, Mr Witham. Witham did not produce it in court, and Christopher Conyers of Hutton Bonville, another recusant whose estate was up for valuation at the same time as Meynell's, calmly handed the Commissioners his own, quite different, list of jurymen, which was accepted. The second lot of jurymen were at the door and duly and rapidly found the two estates as worth only their ancient formal valuations—Meynell's at £5 a year. That was accepted by the Commissioners. The steward estimated the real value as over 200 marks a year; as we shall see, it was actually worth at least £300 a year. The steward accounted for this odd transaction as follows: Witham was a servant of Richard Theakston, Esq., a friend of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; Theakston lived by arranging matters for recusants and actually was made farmer of the small part of Meynell's estate now seized and farmed; John Constable was Conyers' brother-in-law; the second jury contained many of the two recusants' friends. Theakston was, in fact, also a North Riding Justice and M.P. As a result of representations at Westminster by the Bishop of Durham, the Chancellor of the Exchequer ordered a new inquisition, which found Meynell's estate worth £300 a year. Meynell fought this in the Exchequer Court down to 1603—during which years the seizure was stayed—and got the valuation reduced to £15 a year. He and his lawyers now relied on the legal principle that the fining of a recusant must not be made at the expense of innocent third parties. He succeeded in establishing to the satisfaction of

the Barons of the Exchequer that all but £15 worth of the estate was really others' property—of his (still unconvicted) brothers, or 'extended' as pledges for his debts, or held in trust for him by others. That was an impressive achievement. But Thomas Meynell's papers show that his financial condition during these years was precarious. He was pretty certainly telling the truth about the legal ownership of the estate. In fact a detached portion of it, worth about £150–200 a year, was his mother's dower, and she underwent a separate seizure for recusancy. In 1603 he was still fighting hard to limit that and the seizure was stayed pending a decision. His own success depended partly on his brothers' ability to escape conviction as recusants—and when their luck gave out they usually, unlike him, resorted to occasional conformity—and on the real fact that his father's improvidence had left him in debt. Moreover, throughout these years, he found other charges than the recusancy fine more crippling—the fees for the livery, constant bonds to the High Commission and expenses to pursuivants, having to buy back two-thirds of his and his mother's goods and cattle from the sheriff, being mulcted of £15 in 1599 as his share in a levy of light horse from recusants, gaol fees when he was imprisoned by the High Commission. Yet he survived and actually began to buy land; he was to meet and overcome still worse bouts of recusancy fining in later life.⁽⁸⁾

Another example is the Danby family of Masham and Farnley. Sir Thomas Danby, a conformist, died in 1590. He had been the head of a numerous clan of Danbys, the majority of whom displayed, between 1590 and 1603, every degree of Catholic practice, though only a few, like Richard Danby of South Cave, showed a disposition to be unwavering recusants. Sir Thomas's conformist eldest son died before his father, and the estate and eldest grandson, Christopher Danby, fell into the hands of the Court of Wards. The boy's widowed mother was a Catholic, though—apparently by constant movement round the family's houses—she had so far evaded conviction. Sir Thomas had been a personal friend of the Cecils, and the Court of Wards granted the boy's wardship and marriage to them, but the widow succeeded, rather surprisingly, in buying them and the lease of

the estate. She and her son then sojourned 'in divers places, in several shires, where their dearest friends could never have any intelligence of them for the space of xi or xii years'. The only trace of them in Yorkshire presentments at this time is in 1596 at Farnley, Leeds—'Mres Danbie and a scholemaster she kepes in her house non-communicants'. By 1601-2 the boy was of age and the wardship raised. Presumably he now had to sue out livery and was in acute danger of having to take the Oath of Supremacy or of being convicted as a recusant. The widow appealed to William, Lord Mounteagle, who seems to have had some semi-official influence as a protector of recusants, and Christopher eventually married Mounteagle's sister. But in 1603 neither Christopher or his mother had been convicted of recusancy. Of the various parts of the estate occupied by uncles, brothers and cousins, almost all seem to have been sheltered from recusancy fining and seizure either by intermittent conformity of the occupiers or by successful pleas that the land belonged to Christopher. Only Richard Danby had his estate actually seized and the rent of it was only £20. The background to all this appears to have been a period of considerable financial stress on the estate, which was only caused to a minor extent by the Catholicism of Christopher and his mother. The wardship costs must have been very considerable, and, quite apart from the danger to the boy's religion if the Cecils had retained his tuition and marriage, the widow would have been bound to attempt to gain these for herself to save the estate from further loss. It seems that the estate began to get into bad order during the years of the minority; but Christopher later blamed that on to the frauds of a Catholic relation who was his steward.

Thomas Tankard of Boroughbridge had acquired the ex-monastic property of Brampton in the North Riding by marriage and purchase. He was an active Catholic, but was not convicted of recusancy until very shortly before his death in 1597 and seizure was at once ordered. His heir, another Thomas, had been convicted in 1591-2, but—most probably because he was urging that he had no lands of his own—fining was stayed. After his father's death, he got the Barons of the Exchequer to accept that,

by the terms of a marriage settlement and trust, his father had never been more than a life-tenant; the seizure of his father's estate was raised. By 1601 Thomas seems to have urged the same plea equally successfully in his own case, and he appears no more in the Recusant Rolls—though he continued to be presented regularly as an obstinate recusant in ecclesiastical courts for the rest of his life, and his wife and brothers were convicted and fined recusants.⁽⁹⁾

It is worth reviewing briefly a few other cases. John Sayer of Worsall, a wealthy recusant, underwent no seizure between 1592 and 1627 simply because he preferred—and was able—to pay regularly the ordinary £260 a year fine. John Rokeby of Yafforth and Mortham was probably the first North Riding recusant gentleman to undergo seizure—in 1590. Already the Crown was showing a disposition to grant the proceeds of seizures to Crown creditors or courtiers, Rokeby's small seized estate (only worth £20 rent) was leased to a messenger of the Queen's Chamber who always appeared as the official lessee—but in fact he quietly sublet it to Ralph Lawson of Brough, a Catholic, who undoubtedly returned the land to the use of its owner. The Radcliffes of Mulgrave and Babthorpes of Osgodby in the East Riding were, by tradition, the two most striking cases of Catholic gentry who lost their all as a result of recusancy fines. In the case of the Babthorpes, the facts seem to be that it was not recusancy fines but heavy fines for sheltering priests—and, perhaps, bad management and poor lawyers—which led them to sell out and leave the county. The case of the Radcliffes is more complex. As we have seen, Roger Radcliffe was a rather suspect Protestant Justice. He had, by inheritance and buying, become a considerable power in Cleveland and his estate a centre of Catholic activity. In 1592–3 his main estate of Mulgrave Castle was granted by the Crown to Lord Sheffield, who, by 1598, was directing from there a fierce assault on local recusants and priests. By the 1620's Thomas Meynell, a relative and a Catholic, was writing of Roger's grandson and eventual heir, another Roger Radcliffe, as 'nowe a poore gentleman destitute of all meanes to live'. Yet there are other details in the picture. Roger Radcliffe

died in 1587-8, willing Mulgrave to his eldest son, Francis, and Ugthorpe with other lands to his daughter, Katherine Radcliffe. Francis died soon after his father and does not seem to have been presented for recusancy. Mulgrave was lost to Sheffield in 1592-3, about the time that Roger Radcliffe, Francis's son and heir, came of age. He—the 'poor gentleman'—may well have removed from the area, but he occurs in no local presentments and certainly never in the Recusant Rolls. Katherine Radcliffe, the owner of Ugthorpe and Deighton, Northallerton, always unmarried, was a very strong recusant, first convicted in 1590 and with her estate seized for the rest of her life and two-thirds let at a rent of just over £70 a year. She had other Catholic half-brothers and sisters at Lythe who figure intermittently in the Recusant Rolls, but their property was small. Thomas Meynell, speaking of Mulgrave, says 'their lands were lost by reason of pretended Concealment (presumably a supposed flaw in the Radcliffes' lease from the Crown, exploited by Sheffield), as many thinke for want of managinge . . .'. Yet the Radcliffes were not without sympathy and even Court patronage. In 1593, when Katherine was in gaol for her recusancy, the Privy Council noted that suit was made for her release on compassionate grounds by some 'persons here of good accompte at Court' and of near kin to her. Ironically, Lord Sheffield was married to his Catholic wife by a priest in 1581 and in 1598 was still suspected to be a Papist.

In one other case we can trace at least a part of the real background to entries in the Recusant Rolls. Gilbert Metcalfe and his wife, of Hood Grange in Kilburne—a cadet of the Metcalfe family of Nappa—were convicted as recusants by 1592. His property consisted of a lease from the Archbishop of York of the ex-monastic grange at Hood, a lease of the tithes of Fryton, Hovingham, and three properties which he bought (a manor at Firby, 1581, part of a manor at Newton, Leeming, 1588, and a house and land at Tanton, Stokesley, 1596). In each case, he carefully bought in the names of his sons. By 1598 a seizure of the estate had taken place. In fact it covered all of the estate except one small part passing under the name of one of his sons; thus

either Gilbert had not pleaded the deeds of sale to his sons—who were, in fact, not convicted of recusancy themselves until after their father's death, long after 1603—or the Barons disallowed the plea and treated nearly all the estate as Gilbert's. According to the Recusant Rolls, Gilbert's total net income (excluding fines or seizure) was £67 6s. 8d. a year. From 1598 he lost two-thirds of this and two-thirds of the value of his goods. Yet he did not waver under this, and, apart from the loss of Hood Grange some years later (perhaps due to the running out of the lease and refusal to pay a higher rent), his family retained the rest of the estate until the 1650's.⁽¹⁰⁾

For lack of family deeds and estate papers, it will pretty certainly always be impossible to analyse exhaustively the evidence on recusancy fining to 1603. In the first Recusant Roll, of 1592-3, about 300 convicted recusants from the North Riding occur, but at the most only nine or ten then had their estates seized, and the great majority were genuinely poor people. By 1605-6 there were no more than fifty on the Roll, of whom thirty-eight were under seizure, and the long lists of the poor had vanished. There seems little doubt that this development was partly due to a deliberate Exchequer policy of dropping the cases of the poorest, partly to Lord Burghley's drive against recusants (1599-1603), partly to evasive tactics (occasional conformity, pleading of trusts and debts, 'vagrancy') by recusant gentry.

There was one other administrative difficulty about recusancy fining—dealing with recusant wives of conformists. Both at law and as a matter of public policy, it was grossly unfair to penalise a Protestant husband for his wife's recusancy, and, in any case, at law she had no property of her own. In the 1590's efforts were made to put pressure on such husbands to persuade their wives to conform, by imprisoning the wives—in 1592 a whole batch of such gentry wives was gaoled in York or in Sheriff Hutton Castle. But the husbands brought influence to bear and the authorities were soon forced to climb down. But again, by 1603, there were complaints that the authorities were starting to impose fines for recusancy on wives. The problem was unsolved until legislation in the next reign authorised a rather reduced form

of fining of recusant wives. In the whole affair Protestant feeling was severely at odds with a sense of justice and the integrity of family life.

Catholic tradition—with some reservations—strongly emphasised the financial sufferings of Catholics; modern scepticism has come round to regarding them as very much exaggerated. The scepticism is not new. In the sixteenth century Protestants asserted that Catholic gentry positively thrived even when under seizure and that imprisonment enabled them to save money. The truth seems to lie somewhere in the middle. The financial obstacle race for Catholics was in some ways easier, in other ways harder, than we once thought. Much depended on luck, on the legal and financial acumen of recusants and on the flexibility of their consciences. There are striking examples of astonishing escapes, but, by and large, the average scrupulous and determined recusant had to endure severe hardships. That so many long kept their end up in the face of them was due both to faith and also to the fact that contemporary economic and social conditions had long trained the gentry to expect adversity and fight it.

Both in administering the fining system and in the ordinary system of repression, the authorities had much to suffer from their inability to pay their officials a living wage. The keeping of prisons was a difficult matter. There were at least two blatant cases of dereliction of duty by keepers of York Castle—Oswald Wilkinson, the rebel of 1569, and the Redheads in the 1590's—and contemporary Catholic accounts treat bribery of gaolers as a normal procedure. This may be the reason why, in later years, it seems to have been the custom to include recusants amongst the sureties for the standing recognisances imposed on keepers of the Castle. In 1592 the keeper of the temporary gaol for recusant gentry's wives at Sheriff Hutton Castle was quite unable to resist the influence of his charges and their husbands and families. But the most documented of all cases of a gaoler is that of Robert Worsley, Esq., of the Booths in Cheshire and of Hovingham in the North Riding. When it was decided, in the mid-1580's, to expand the prison accommodation to cope with

recusancy, the New Fleet at Salford was opened. (This was for the diocese of Chester, which included Richmondshire.) Robert Worsley, a strong Protestant, and friend both of Bishop Chaderton of Chester and Huntingdon, undertook to be gaoler. But he, though never charged with any dereliction of duty or fault other than over-severity to his recusant and priest prisoners, became a liability to the authorities. He soon complained that the poorer recusant prisoners could not, or would not, pay for their keep and that he was running into personal debt rapidly. An effort to finance the gaol by the levy of a rate for poor prisoners from the diocese repeatedly met a complete checkmate; the gentry would not pay. An effort was then made to use the fines levied on recusants or their forfeited bond money. But it was then reported by the Exchequer that, of £757 of this money due to them from the Chester High Commission, only £40 had arrived. This created a sensation, but it is significant that Chaderton did not pursue this method for financing the gaol—he must have found it impossible to make any impression on the corrupt habits of the Commission's permanent lower officials. As a last resort, Worsley was granted a licence to inform on unconvicted recusants and so secure the informer's third of their seized property. In March 1590-1 Worsley forwarded to the Exchequer, with the counter-signatures of the Bishop and the Earl of Derby, a detailed claim, that he had been gaoler for nine years, that for two of them he had had to maintain the diets of his priest prisoners and of numbers of poor recusants at his own expense, and in the other years had always had a big debit balance. He had, he said, been responsible for the conviction of over 300 recusants and his own costly investigations had alone made the seizures of their lands and goods possible and profitable to the State. Yet the Exchequer had disallowed most of his expense accounts and only paid him a fraction of the share of the seizures due to him. In January 1604-5 his widow was still petitioning for justice, and claiming that he had brought into the Exchequer £7,697 of recusant money at a cost in expenses to him of £6,308 (presumably she means to include the gaol expenses in this figure); yet all he received was £1,277. Equally notable are the

Observations appointed by the Lord President', sent by Lord Burghley to the York High Commission in December 1601, which reveal that, at any rate immediately before this time, there had been no proper register of fines and forfeited bonds, the bonds of recusants had not been kept safely, and no record had been kept of all discharges.⁽¹¹⁾

General penal legislation against Catholics multiplied during this period, but its progress towards becoming anything worth dignifying with the name of a 'code' was slow. Moreover, like the fining system, these statutes took time to settle, a time in which it was usually discovered that there were loopholes and unforeseen inconveniences, in which lawyers and judges fell to work to gloss the text or limit its application. *1 Eliz.cap.1* (1559) laid severe penalties on those who maintained the Pope's supremacy in public and also imposed the Oath of supremacy on those appointed to civil or ecclesiastical offices or suing out livery for lands held by knight service or socage, or taking a University degree. But the execution of these clauses was not quite exact. As we have seen, in the diocese of York, those already in benefices were not required to take the Oath, and those instituted for long after 1559 were faced with formulae which, however equivalent to it in practice, were not the Oath. Justices and attorneys sometimes took the Oath, at other times did not, taking shelter under the vagueness of the clause. It needed a further statute (*5 Eliz.cap.1*, 1563) to clarify the matter, but this still left loopholes. It named teachers, teaching barristers, attorneys, sheriffs, those administering the law. In fact it is likely that teachers in York diocese were licenced in the later sixteenth century with subscription to something like the incumbents' oath, and any acquaintance with York visitation records of the period shows a profusion of unofficial, unlicenced teachers (by no means necessarily all Catholic-minded) and a tendency of even grammar school masters to be slow and slack about subscription. As we have seen, Lambarde in the 1590's knew of Justices who had evaded the Oath. Catholic law students at the Inns of Court and even ordinary barristers are a well-known feature of the period and even of the first decades of the

seventeenth century. Some undoubtedly were Church-papists and conformists when at their Inn of Court, but it is probable that others always evaded the Oath—like Anthony Metcalfe of Hood Grange, sent by his father to Christ's, Cambridge, in 1575, then to Staple Inn and the Inner Temple, where he was a barrister and recusant in 1587, or Thomas Pudsey of Barforth, pensioner at Trinity College, Cambridge, from 1586, to the Inner Temple in 1593 and thereafter a strong recusant and legal adviser of recusants. As we have seen, the livery clause offered a difficulty to Catholics; but some, like Thomas Meynell, undoubtedly bribed their way through without taking the Oath, while conformists—heads or heirs of families in part Catholic—must have taken it. The university clause in itself hardly barred the Universities to Catholics. A glance through Venn and Foster's *Alumni* shows that the great majority of Yorkshire gentry families, Catholic-minded or not, joined solidly in the fashionable rush of young laymen to the universities, beginning precisely in the early 1560's. At that period—and on to the mid-1580's—they and their families cannot very often have objected outright to the taking of Protestant religious tests (as we have seen, Catholicism was then an inchoate thing for many, a matter of habits, feelings, tendencies). On the side of the authorities there was no disposition until the mid-1580's to make things impossibly hard for such people. On the teaching staffs of colleges, Catholicism died by very slow degrees, and even in the 1580's there were to be found tutors like Legge and Swale at Caius and, in the 1590's, Mr Case in Oxford, who were occasional conformists and 'mislikers'. Oxford did not require a religious test at matriculation before 1581; Cambridge never required one. Anyway, the average gentry undergraduates had no intention of taking a degree, and short courses for them, of an extra-curricular kind, abounded. The slow protestantisation of the universities came about, less through legislation from above than from a change of ethos in the universities themselves, helped by Protestant preaching, college statutes, the influence of tutors and, undoubtedly, the hardening of the Catholic body at large, the decline of Church-popery and the rise of Catholic colleges abroad.

13 *Eliz.cap.2* (1571) met the rise of reconciling priests with faculties by making reconciling or being reconciled to the Catholic Church treason, and concealing knowledge of a reconciliation misprision of treason. It also imposed the penalties of *Praemunire* (confiscation of all property and imprisonment at pleasure) on those who (like Thomas Williamson of Scarborough) were caught importing Catholic dispensations, Bulls, vestments, rosaries or crucifixes. For the next decade this remained the law. We have few direct sources of evidence on its impact on the Catholic laity, since the Assize and Council of the North records are lacking. It is true that ecclesiastical records do very occasionally mention charges of reconciling or being reconciled, but in no case do they imply that the accused was sent to the Assizes for trial. Thus Thomas Bell, Francis Parkinson and Michael Tirry, between 1572 and 1575 openly admitted, in speech or writing, before the High Commission that the Pope is the head of the Church and the first two confessed that they had been reconciled—possibly before the Act of 1571 became law. In October 1571 batches of priests and laymen from Richmondshire and Lancashire were summoned to the High Commission on charges which several times included reconciliation. Some were not caught, others seem to have made gestures or promises of conformity—again, it is possible that the reconciliations, if true, took place before the Act. However, in none of these cases is there mention of the Assizes. In 1576 a Marian priest, Henry Cumberford, openly confessed the primacy of the Pope—but it is quite clear that no proceedings were made against him under the Statute of 1559. As we shall see, it is dangerous to make any conclusions so long as civil court records are not available, but, on the evidence we have, it would seem that, in spite of the alarmist preamble of the 1571 Act, implying masses of reconciliations in the north, the authorities were little more disposed to press the letter of the law consistently than they had been before 1571—indeed, the name ‘papist’ occurs fairly often in court records of the later 1570’s, as a description of recusants being dealt with only in the ordinary High Commission ways.⁽¹²⁾

23 *Eliz.cap.1* (1581) was doubtless the result of the Campion-

Persons mission, the Continental situation and the authorities' idea that recusancy was fast increasing. Apart from the new £20 recusancy fine, it imposed a fine and imprisonment on those hearing or saying Mass, or teaching Catholicism without licence, and made the clause of 1571 on reconciliation more explicit. During the four years before the next penal law there is still no civil court book evidence, but at least two reports of condemnations of Yorkshire lay Catholics at the Assizes. The ecclesiastical records have only one case—John Cragill of Pickering, delated to the High Commission in January 1584-5 for arguing furiously with the parish clerk and parishioners, upholding Catholic doctrine strongly, using the books of 'Sanders, Hart and Campion'. But even so, personally he was accused of no more than non-communicating during the last three years, and the High Commission was informed that he died on the day he was due to appear in court. The three North Riding gentry gaoled in London for sheltering Campion acted, and were treated, very diversely. Grimston offered to conform, and was bonded to appear both at the York Assizes and the Star Chamber. We do not know what the indictments against him were, and, in any case, he was soon free and a Justice of the Peace. Rokeby was apparently left in gaol in London for some years and then freed, still a recusant. Harrington certainly conformed, but we do not know if he was indicted. In fact no mention of reconciling seems to have occurred in the indictments of Campion and his priest friends, though—as we have seen—the authorities later credited him with much reconciling in the Riding. Five seminary priests were executed at York in 1582-3, two for the Supremacy, and three for reconciling. So far as we know no lay person was accused of being reconciled by them, except the two York apostates who betrayed William Hart; the other two reconcilers were condemned from their own general confessions of the fact. We hear of the successful flight of one gentleman who had sheltered James Thompson. Yet at least a dozen other seminary priests were captured in the county between 1582 and 1585 and not executed. One or two escaped from prison, one was spared for a gesture of part-conformity (Edmund Sykes), another

(apparently) for giving information (William Deane), and another (Samuel Conyers) reprieved after sentence. We know nothing in detail of the rest. There is clear evidence that the Privy Council no more regarded execution of even treason laws as automatic now than they had done in 1569-70 or in 1536. As ever, they were concerned about deterrence, public opinion, hopes of conformity, and even shortage of prison accommodation. Executions could certainly not take place at York without their express permission. It was hoped to make them planned *autos-da-fe*; but the reports of the Assize Judges after the condemnations of priests at York in 1582 were discouraging. The Privy Council was even soon complaining that seminary priests died in a thoroughly unfitting and disloyal manner. It is, of course, also likely that a good number of the priests spared yielded some degree of conformity or professed in court their loyalty and doubts about the 'scholastic questions' concerning the Pope's deposing power. Lastly—though this is a point where the legal historians must help us—it is very possible that the lawyers were genuinely divided (and the divines) on the morality of the slippery path of constructive interpretations of treason on which all English governments since 1534 had floundered. At the trials of the five priests in 1582-3 there was a clear tendency of attorneys and judges to argue that ordination overseas or receiving or reconciliation by authority from Rome was tantamount to breach of the Act of 1559 and of the old Treasons Acts. The Act of 1571 had been bold in giving statutory authority to the second part of this thesis, the first part was not to receive its authority until 1585—the same year in which like pressing administrative reasons brought dubious short-cuts in the recusancy fining procedure.⁽¹³⁾

The Act of 1581 contained other clauses worth special notice. One ordered that obstinate recusants (guilty of at least one year of recusancy) on refusal to conform must be bound in £200 to keep 'the good behaviour'. The other clause said that where gentry had the facilities (a house chapel and chaplain) and had usually exercised them in the past, they might continue to have their ordinary Sunday and holiday services at home—using the

Book of Common Prayer—provided they and their households went to the parish church on the four chief festivals of the year. There was doubt about the meaning of 'the good behaviour' when applied to recusants; some (according to Lambarde) thought it meant a bond to conform by a fixed date, others merely a general obligation to keep the peace. In fact the Privy Council soon issued instructions, and we can observe in the High Commission court books the hardening of a set form of bond—to keep conformist servants, avoid recusants and priests, use Protestant books and school texts, employ conformist tutors and licenced chaplains, and obey the 1581 clause on manor house chapel services. The house chapel clause casts a flood of light in a dark corner—not only on the home life of Tudor gentry, but on the difficulties of churchwardens in making up presentments for recusancy and, chiefly, on the government's inability to change immemorial customs even where they endangered its religious policy.

27 *Eliz.cap.2* (1585) definitely authorised the extremist lawyers' theories about treason and made ordination abroad equivalent to treason if the priest came home and stayed there. Similarly, to shelter such a priest became a capital felony, to relieve them *Praemunire*, and not to inform on them cost a fine of 200 marks. Parents sending their children abroad for education without licence were liable to large fines. 35 *Eliz.caps.1* and 2 (1592) mainly dealt with Protestant recusants, but was interpreted (at any rate for a time and in part) as including papists. Those obstinate after three months must abjure the realm (this is the part which does not seem to have been enforced in practice on Catholics, though some efforts to enforce it occurred in York), and all recusants, after conviction, were not to move out of a radius of five miles from their homes without special licence. The Act also significantly altered one detail in its predecessor—a recusant might now lawfully keep in his house close recusant relations if they had no other means of support. As a whole the Act is of a piece with earlier ones; it shows the same preoccupation with legalising already existing administrative devices and ironing out practical difficulties. Quite apart from high considera-

tions of policy, the whole code reflects the practical Tudor administrator, trying to make effective, in the face of crippling difficulties and changing circumstances, his system of repression. In fact it was an old principle that a penalty for misprision of felony was forced exile, and the administrators had experimented with it already—for instance in banishing over seventy imprisoned priests in 1585. But could three months' recusancy be regarded as a felony of that gravity? The quiet disuse of this clause shows that the administrators had overstepped the mark. The five-mile clause was backed with penalties of *Praemunire* and should have made life burdensome for the gentry, since licences for local travel required the signatures of the bishop of the diocese and Justices, while movement to London needed the Privy Council's written order. The running of scattered estates and the constant litigation of landowners, on the other hand, made travel essential. It was a shrewd move, again preceded by experiments.

It is a well-known fact that the years 1585-1603 saw a great increase in capital indictments and executions of Catholics in the county. Ecclesiastical court activity against recusants, after a slack period following the persecution of 1580-2, picked up again and was strong in the 1590's. But, on this background (which reflects the increased numbers of mission priests and recusants), we are still struck by the evidence of evasions and non-execution of the statutes. Thirty-eight Catholics were executed in the county—twenty-one priests, seventeen laypeople. At least another twenty-one seminary priests were caught but not executed. We can pass over three of these, who escaped successfully from gaol, and another six who definitely apostatised. We may suspect apostasy in the cases of some of the other twelve, but at least five or six did not, apparently, conform, and yet were kept in gaol for years, some with sentences of death for treason passed on them. In the very week of November 1585 that one priest was executed in York, no less than twenty-two captive priests (mostly 'old priests', but some five or six seminary priests) were exiled to the Continent from York and Hull prisons. Of the seventeen laypeople executed, two were indicted for denying the Royal Supremacy on their own confessions, one

for being reconciled, and three for helping in the reconciliation of another; the rest were charged with harbouring priests. But at least twenty-one or twenty-two others were charged with harbouring and not executed. Thus in 1593 Ann Thwing of Heworth was caught in the act of sheltering a priest, Page, who was executed. She was still in gaol, uncondemned, in 1595. In 1596, when three laymen were executed for helping at a reconciliation, two women and Mr Stapleton of Carlton and his wife were equally charged with the same offence. The women were condemned, reprieved, and still in York Castle in 1600; the Stapletons seem to have secured a pardon by influence. Two other women died in the Castle in the 1590's, reprieved after sentence for harbouring a priest. Lady Constable of Burton Constable was indicted in 1595 for harbouring a priest at Kirkby Knowle, but secured, with some difficulty, a complete pardon by influence at Court. Richard Clebourne of Killerby, Catterick, was accused of harbouring Mountford Scott, a seminary priest, in 1584; he was gaoled in London until at least 1586, and was then released on bond to take the waters at Bath. His own second son was a Douai mission priest. His wife was a recusant in 1590, but the family then vanishes from Killerby presentments, though it retained the property for many years to come. It is very likely therefore that Richard conformed by degrees. The case of Joseph Constable of Upsall Castle is much more interesting and documented. He was the younger brother of the wealthiest Church-papist in the county, Sir Henry Constable of Burton Constable, and steward of his brother's liberty of Holderness. Joseph was a 'vagrant' papist long hunted in vain by the President as a shelterer of seminary priests. In 1593 two priests were captured at Upsall; one, Clarke, apostatised and gave much evidence. As a result, Joseph's sister-in-law, Lady Constable—as we have seen—was charged with harbouring, and an indictment was drawn up against Joseph at the Lent Assizes. He was not to be found, and was outlawed. At last, in 1597 he was captured at Upsall, with two vagrant gentry companions, Francis Wycliffe (the heir of Wycliffe) and Cuthbert Plusgrave. The Council of the North was determined to press through their condemnation

and execution—on the grounds that, even if small fry and women could be reprieved, so notable a catch could not be allowed to escape without giving the impression to the county that the government did not really mean business. It is clear that recent cases of pardons had much encouraged Church-papists. But the secretary of the Council pointed out bitterly that condemnation would be very hard. In the first place, the evidence was not strong and the 1593 indictment badly drawn. Far more important, Constable was very highly-connected and his friends at Court would undoubtedly exercise powerful influence on his behalf. His sister-in-law had already escaped that way. He might conform to the extent of going to church a few times and, on release, return to his old ways, ‘as,’ said the secretary, ‘others in like case’. Also Constable at law owned very little—all was in the names of his brother and his own son, who was a vagrant papist still not caught. Thus his friends at Court could plead—as had been done so often in 1569–70—that the Queen would gain nothing financially by his condemnation and death. Moreover, the Council of the North in 1597 was in a weak position; Huntingdon was dead, the Archbishop an unpopular President, officialdom at York under fire from every quarter, and the Essex faction on the rise. In fact Joseph resorted to occasional conformity—and seems to have kept this up for the rest of his life. While in gaol he soon was—with the grateful thanks of the Council—signing affidavits against Redhead, the gaoler of York Castle. Redhead was a scoundrel, no friend of Catholics as such and ready to trap Joseph and Lady Constable into charges of treason; but he was easily bribable, and the Council wanted to get rid of him. He had recently let two men, Preston and Saunderson, convicted of treason—cases about which we would like to know more—escape from the castle. The Council was not yet, in spite of the affidavits, able to get him removed. Joseph seems to have been out of the castle by 1599, pardoned. His two companions refused to take oaths to answer charges. They could have been removed to London to undergo the torture which the Council at York had no power to inflict, but the political situation and the relative unimportance of the prisoners and

lack of other evidence against them led to the dropping of proceedings for harbouring. Wycliffe, at least, stayed in York Castle until his death there.⁽¹⁴⁾

Of the others taken into custody for harbouring but not executed, two escaped from the castle, two seem to have been let go because of lack of evidence, and we know nothing of the treatment of the rest. Thus Ralph Tankard of Arden had a distinguished Jesuit son, but was himself a conformist. In the 1590's, a furious and discreditable feud arose between the Meynells of Hawnbry and their neighbours, the Tankards, which eventually became a cause for jest and even ribald songs in the countryside around. Tankard and his family were accused of treason, but the case does not seem to have progressed very far. Richard Willy, yeoman, of South Otterington was accused by an anonymous informer in 1590 of a string of crimes ranging from adultery to recusancy and sheltering three named priests. He was cited to the High Commission but his case soon faded out of their book, and, in fact, he was never presented as a recusant at South Otterington. Over and above all this, at least thirty gentry in the county were, at one time or another during these years, informed on as harbourers of priests. The fullest informations came from Young and Clarke, two apostate priests, in 1592-3, and the York authorities declared their intention of following up the cases. Perhaps the missing civil records gave the cases—but it seems significant that the very detailed Catholic memoirs of prisoners in York gaols between 1587 and 1596 contain no reference to them at all. In general, it seems that the Statute making harbouring a capital felony had a powerful effect on Catholics, even if somewhat fitful or hesitant execution of the Statute diminished its deterrent force somewhat. It does seem that the Catholic gentry were, in these years, building up a strong reluctance to shelter priests for any length of time under their roofs—a reluctance which, as we shall see, lasted until after 1660. Hence missionaries very rarely resided in houses, and usually remained peripatetic and miserably vulnerable in times of strong persecution. As we shall see, they organised resting-houses for themselves—usually unoccupied, hired houses in

remote places. It seems very notable that most priests who were caught were either in rest-houses or on the road.⁽¹⁵⁾

Although it must have been sufficiently obvious that, wherever there was a group of Catholics at this period, there must have been converts, we meet astonishingly few references to charges of being reconciled. Even though, by 1595, Huntingdon and Hutton were employing the full-time services of half-a-dozen apostate priests who had worked as missionaries in the Riding, we have no evidence of any consequent wave of prosecutions for conversion. It is likely that none of the six had worked long in Yorkshire, and that those against whom they gave information either fled or conformed. The five-mile restriction, of course, did not affect vagrants (like the Danbys) or Church-papists (like the Cholmleys). Its effect on recusant gentry—to judge from the papers of Thomas Meynell of North Kilvington—was to create a nuisance but not to restrict his freedom of movement much. He accumulated a sheaf of licences to travel, dated successively and each valid for four to six months; if in a hurry, he seems to have written out most of the form himself, to save time. The restriction on Catholic tutors must have had an effect, but it is hard to judge. The ecclesiastical records of the period mention only three in this period—Thomas Poole, the town schoolmaster at Bedale, a suspect recusant in 1598, an unlicensed master at Roger Talbot of Thornton-le-Street's house in 1590, another (Jerome Bolton) at Whitby in 1596 in association with the Cholmleys. But the Visitation Books leave us with an impression that the licencing system for schoolmasters was badly run; apparently perfectly Protestant masters of grammar schools were often found to be unlicensed. The restrictions on sending boys abroad to school also must have had an effect. At any rate the number of boys and young men (usually passing abroad and back through the current 'underground railways' used by priests) from the Riding who got through to Douai, Rheims and Rome was very small—though it begins to increase steadily after 1595. That may reflect the relaxing of government pressure of the time, or the start of a fashion amongst Catholics, a consequence of the solidifying of the hard core of determinedly recusant

families unwilling to compromise. However, the boys who went abroad between 1595 and 1603 were not, in fact, drawn very noticeably from uncompromisingly recusant families. As for prosecutions for hearing Mass, we meet very little reference to them—in 1590 an informer reported ‘common fame of a Mass done at Holtby Hole (Hornby) last St Bartholomew’s day’; in 1591 Alice Ovington was said to have been ‘married at a Mass . . . in a field in the dark by a priest’. Neither information seems to have borne much fruit—and they are so vague or inaccurate that it is not surprising.⁽¹⁶⁾

This survey of ‘action by Statute’ against Catholics leaves us with a mixture of impressions. In many ways it was very effective—especially against priests; it swept up into gaols the great majority of the surviving ‘old’ Catholic priests, and caught at least forty-two seminary priests in Yorkshire. It made the missionary effort exceedingly difficult for the survivors. It made the small hard core of determined recusants fight hard for survival, and drove the majority of the Catholic-minded into occasional conformity. But, on the other hand, ‘action by Statute’ proved quite incapable of destroying Catholicism or even of preventing it from a slow but definite growth, especially amongst the all-important gentry. Apart from ‘action by Statute’ there was ‘prerogative action’ by the Council of North and High Commission—the latter with its necessary handmaids, the ecclesiastical courts. On the whole, this form of repressive action was not much more effective. For lack of its own records we know little about the Council of the North’s own direct action against Catholics (as opposed to its action simply as a police force for the statutory authorities and the High Commission). Thomas Meynell’s ‘Book’ contains what seems to be a rare and precious bit of evidence of this. He says:

When Thomas Lord Burleigh . . . was President . . . he showed himselfe forward in prosecution of the Lawes established against us poore Catholicks . . . I had been committed before by Henry Earle of Huntingdon but I was a prisoner almost all my Lord Burleighe his Presidencie. He committed me to his Pursuivants howse. But Sr Edward Stanoppe knight

solde me awaye to the North-blockhowse at . . . Hull. Meynell was imprisoned by the High Commissioners (of whom Huntingdon was the chief) for three months in 1594; but his imprisonment from 1599-1603 may well be an example of direct Council action, since his name does not occur amongst Catholics committed by the High Commission during those years. During Huntingdon's last years he was chairman of a special Royal Commission against Jesuits. That was the Yorkshire equivalent of numbers of other similar Commissions operating in other parts of England at the time. They were designed to do police action—searches of houses, arrests of suspects, examinations of recusants—to secure the conviction of missionaries and lay harbourers at the Assizes. It is hard to see that such a new body could do anything more than increase the already acute complexity of repressive machinery existing in Yorkshire, and there is no clear evidence that it accomplished much.⁽¹⁷⁾

There is no doubt that the High Commission and ecclesiastical courts made a more frequent and extensive impact on the lives of Catholics than all the other authorities added together. Between 1582 and 1603 the York High Commission summoned well over 500 North Riding people for offences related to Catholicism, and the ordinary ecclesiastical courts summoned well over 1,500. The High Commission's record is impressive in other ways; in these years its periods of rest or slackness were few (1584, 1587-9—oddly enough, 1600-1); it pummelled a good many recusants with repeated attendances before it, repeated charges for expenses, repeated bonds. The nuisance effect of all this was very considerable, but the lasting damage it inflicted on the Catholic body was very limited. Of the 500 North Riding people it dealt with, a large proportion dodged attendance or simply do not seem to have been pursued perseveringly. Forty-six were committed to imprisonment—in twenty years; and of these the great majority were only confined briefly in a pursuivant's house to get them to take an oath to answer charges or to take a bond. Oddly enough the Commission, though now dealing with many more Catholics than in the years 1572-82, was inflicting much fewer and lighter imprisonments than then.

In dealing with the 150 recusants and non-communicants from the Riding whom it got into court, the Commission adapted its treatment to each case. It seems that it pressed on those whom it judged likely to give in bonds to conform. Some eighty took these bonds and fifty-six certified conformity, though at least half of them at some later period lapsed back into non-communicating, occasional conformity or recusancy. Another seventy—apparently judged more obstinate but not provocative—took bonds only to confer with divines or to reappear when summoned or to have Anglican services in their houses. To judge from the court records, conferences only rarely brought about conformity.

The Archiepiscopal visitation and Chancery courts and the Archdeacons' courts performed several functions in the system of repression. They had a nuisance value through repeated summonses and the threat of excommunication; they acted as feeders for the High Commission; they had a particular nuisance value in uncovering cases of Catholic clandestine baptisms, marriages and burials, which went on to either the Chancery court or the High Commission. There is no doubt that they were an integral and essential part of the whole machine and its activities would have been hamstrung without them. But there were limits to their effectiveness. Thus in the 1590 visitations, of 61 persons presented for recusancy or persistent non-communicating in Ryedale deanery 20 appeared in court, of 208 in Cleveland only 6, of 44 in Catterick deanery 2, of 141 in Richmond deanery 4, and of 7 in Allertonshire all. A few of these cases were noted as already before the High Commission; in others an appearance was made to certify conformity, and the rest who appeared were merely enjoined to conform. The visitors did not use bonds. In 1600 there is one isolated case where the Archiepiscopal visitor actually committed a man (who refused an oath to swear to his evidence) to the custody of the apparitor for a few hours and released him with an injunction to obey. Curiously enough there seem to be hardly any references to excommunication of contumacious recusants before 1598; thereafter it slowly became normal to excommunicate them—or were they all along excommunicated

automatically but the fact not recorded before 1598? At any rate after 1598, if not before, excommunication was the only penalty of consequence a Catholic had to fear from these courts (apart from the certainty that they would pass the presentment on to the High Commissioners). The greater excommunication deprived of the right to ecclesiastical burial and to plead or give evidence in civil suits or to act as guardian or trustee. It seems that the excommunicate could secure absolution by appearing (by self or attorney) in court and professing some willingness to obey, receiving an injunction to conform. But that process clearly had to be repeated at each visitation. Denial of ecclesiastical burial to excommunicates was common form, but cases of clandestine burials of excommunicated recusants in churches and churchyards by their friends at night-time only seem to occur in the Riding after 1598-1600—perhaps additional evidence that they were not often automatically excommunicated for recusancy before that time. Similarly, it is only after 1603 that it becomes common form for the North Riding Catholic gentry to ward off excommunication—liable also to upset their litigation—by sending attorneys to seek absolution at most visitations.

The prosecution of cases of clandestine Catholic baptisms and marriages seems to have been very infrequent before about 1590. After that they multiply quickly—but so, unfortunately, do cases of clandestine marriages in general and it becomes hard to distinguish Catholic cases from Protestant ones. Cases of Catholic baptisms done in secret could be given some cover by the plea that the child was in danger of death (which was then often true) and that the parents or midwife baptised. Clandestine marriages were a far more complex matter and much more dangerous for Catholics. The bulk of pre-Reformation Canon Law on marriage (apart from statutory recognition of divorce for adultery, and different Anglican rules on the impediments of kindred and affinity) was retained in use by the York courts after 1559. Thus those who married clandestinely (without minister and witnesses), whatever the status of their union in conscience, were regarded as invalidly married *in foro externo* and practically equivalent to those living in concubinage. Of course, quite apart from this,

there were lesser degrees of clandestinity—omitting banns, being married away from the couple's proper church. If a marriage were proved to be clandestine in the full sense, the parties were put to public penance and made to certify a new, Anglican marriage. Until this was done, by ancient Statutes, the wife had no legal right to dower nor their children to inheritance. Before 1590 we hear of only four North Riding cases where what may well have been a Catholic marriage was challenged in the York courts. The outcome of the cases is never clear, though in two the parties were gaoled, and in one put on bond to certify an Anglican marriage. The extreme paucity of cases and surviving informations may mean that secret Catholic marriages were taking place but that the courts were not yet geared into the procedure for coping with them, or informed of them—but it is much more likely that Catholics after 1559 got into the habit of being married at their parish churches, and only by 1590 were definite recusants being persuaded by missionaries to abandon the practice. Thus in 1591 Alice and John Ovington of Forcett were married secretly by a Catholic priest, and Richard Danby of South Cave and Masham married in a manor house in the West Riding by a priest; in 1592 Richard Dutton of Whitby was married by a priest in the house chapel at Ripley; in 1599 Christopher Burdon of Hutton Bonville married there by an 'old' priest secretly; in 1594 Robert Allanby of Skelton married by an 'old' priest; in 1591 Christopher Thorpe of Ugthorpe married in a field at Billingham on Tees by a Catholic priest. By 1603-4 it was common form to accuse several couples in any sizeable Catholic group of living in fornication, 'being married we know not where or by whom, suspected by a papist priest'. The cases went to the High Commission or Chancery court, where the parties were put on bond to 'prove' their marriages. If they gave evidence of a clandestine marriage or failed to produce witnesses, they were penanced and bonded to certify an Anglican remarriage. Some submitted to this, but an increasing majority took refuge in contumacy or flight. The gentry sought means of evasion. One was to make use of a stratagem, hiring some unemployed and shiftless Anglican curate to witness a ceremony

(perhaps the betrothal) in one part of a house, and then going to another room to the priest for the marriage. A more thorough-going way was to employ an 'old' priest. It could then be argued in court that the minister was a lawful one, that witnesses had been present, that the Anglican form was used (in fact the crucial words were almost identical with those of the Sarum Ritual used by missionaries)—and therefore that the marriage was valid but illicit; no remarriage could then be required. As we shall see later, Thomas Meynell of Kilvington established the validity of this latter method before the York Chancery court after 1603.

Therefore there is good reason to suppose that some of the ineffectivenesses of the York ecclesiastical courts were peculiar to the years before 1590, and that from that date excommunications and marriage cases became quite rapidly major weapons against Catholics. In general it is also clear that at least one reason for the non-use of these weapons before the 1590's was the prevalence of part-conformism amongst Catholics—a phenomenon which contributed, as we have seen, considerably to the inability of the whole system of repression to destroy Catholicism.⁽¹⁸⁾

The second great general feature of the period 1582–1603 was a considerable increase in the number of seminary priests in Yorkshire. It will always remain impossible to pinpoint exactly the numbers of seminary priests and their movements, but enough records and indications survive to enable us to make some general conclusions. Some thirty-five North Riding men (or at least men who were very possibly born in the Riding) became seminary priests during these years. Some certainly cannot have worked as missionaries in the Riding—for instance Seth Foster of Overton, who passed straight from the English College at Douai to enter the Bridgettine Order and to spend the rest of his life in its convents in Flanders; John Pibush of Thirsk, who came to England in 1589 and no doubt passed by Thirsk to Lancashire where he seems to have spent most of his short mission life before his martyrdom in 1595; William Harrington of Mount St John, near Thirsk, whose short mission career was spent in and around London; John Smithson (of Moulton?) who,

as a newly ordained priest, sailed as a naval chaplain on the ill-fated third Spanish Armada of 1596 and died at sea; William Clarkson of Northallerton, who, after ordination, lived in Milan for some years and was caught at once on landing at Dover in 1599. There are at least sixty-five seminary priests who, most likely, either passed through the Riding or worked there at this period. We can only give a few examples of them here. We have already seen the early career of Thomas Bell of Thirsk. He entered England as a priest in 1582—probably landing in the north, since he was at work in York by July of that year and had not left Rome before 12 May. There survives an astonishing account of him as he was that July, in a letter to Rome from one of his priest-companions in Yorkshire, Anthony Tyrrell. According to Tyrrell, Bell organised a mass visitation in secret of York Castle by himself and four other priests, accompanied by laymen from York city. They climbed into the Castle, heard confessions and celebrated very early in the morning four Masses, followed by a sung High Mass with full ceremonies. On their way out one priest was arrested. The account contains very unlikely details (for instance gross exaggerations of the numbers of Catholics in the Castle and in York at that time) and was written by a man given to exaggerations. Yet we have plenty of evidence that the York gaolers were very corrupt and complaisant and that Mass and the Sacraments were quite possible in Tudor prisons. Moreover, however highly-coloured, the letter surely does reflect part of the outlook of the new missionaries of those years. They were mostly very ardent converts, fresh from the open, public Catholic life of Flanders or Italy, full of zeal and impatient with the state of Catholic life in England. Bell—or so the college at Douai heard—was captured about this time, but was somehow free in 1585. We next hear of him at work in Lancashire where he seems to have had some sort of authority over the other missionaries. By 1591 he was reported to be changing his views and saying that Catholics might go to Anglican churches if necessary, and in October 1592 he apostatised and came back to Yorkshire to act as one of the group of ex-Catholic divines whom Huntingdon was using to hunt priests and confer with

Catholics. It is to this last period of his career that belong the few surviving writings by him—his elaborate *exposé* of the Lancashire mission, its priests, mission centres, faithful, given to the government (fortunately he knew little of the Yorkshire mission of 1592), his letters, his anti-Catholic tracts. It was perhaps characteristic of the extremism which accompanied him through life that, residing in Jesus College, Cambridge, in June 1593, he confidently asserted that he was writing a book of controversy against Popery the like of which was 'to my knowledge never yet attempted by any man', so that 'no papist in the world is or shall be able to stand in denial of the same'.⁽¹⁹⁾

There were Martin and Thomas Nelson of Overton, brothers of the martyr, John Nelson. We catch glimpses of Martin in Cleveland in 1593 and 1599. In 1601 he was taken with another priest when travelling, caught in the net of Lord Burghley's great sweep for priests. The President reported to London that Martin had once before been captured and had then apostatised, but returned to the Church. If that is true, he must have been back to Douai, as was usual in such cases, before the reconciled priest was allowed on the mission again. This time he again apostatised. His brother Thomas, on the contrary, seems to have had a very long and undisturbed mission life. In 1603 the Douai register noted that he had just paid a brief visit to the college to swear allegiance to the new Archpriest, and that he had had twenty years on the mission. In 1609 he was working in North Wales. Thomas Palliser was a native of Kirkby Wiske. He left Valladolid for the English mission in December 1596, but was caught soon after landing in the south and imprisoned in the Gatehouse, Westminster. He soon escaped from there—not a difficult operation, since he had been allowed out of his prison on parole. He left a letter for the London authorities, attempting to apologise for his breach of parole and protesting his loyalty to the Queen. He must have made straight for the north of the Riding, where we pick up traces of his brief missionary career at Worsall, Northallerton (the Sayers), Osmotherly (a boy convert of his from there soon afterwards went abroad to become a priest), Lartington (another convert, to be a priest) and South

Otterington (the Talbots). In 1600 he was captured with a group of Allertonshire and Durham gentry at a house in Co. Durham and martyred with some of his hosts. Thomas Thoresby of Barden, Hauxwell, belonged to the inner ring of determined gentry recusants in Richmondshire. Nevertheless his family was divided in religion. He had conformist half-brothers, one of whom was a bencher of Lincoln's Inn and Master in Chancery, and the other—at whose house at Thorganby in the East Riding Thomas lived before leaving for Douai—was to be the ancestor of Ralph Thoresby the antiquarian. Thomas and his brother John went to Douai, where John died, but Thomas completed his course, was ordained and left for the mission early in 1600, escorting a Yorkshire schoolboy on his way home. The priest—a familiar pattern—was caught on landing and gaoled in London, where he returned evasive answers to his examiners and would not outright admit that he was a priest. He was spared and sent to a special prison for priests at Framlingham, whence he was exiled in 1603. To return after exile was to court certain death, but he nevertheless very soon made his way back to the mission to Yorkshire—perhaps landing in the north this time. It appears that he was caught again by 1606, perhaps without the York authorities realising his history or his priesthood, and, in any case, was at liberty and working on the Yorkshire mission in 1609. Richard Johnson (alias Bartholomew Layton) came of farming stock at Healaugh in Richmondshire, and, according to his own account, his parents were Church-papists. He went to York into an attorney's office, and then was for sixteen years an usher in the grammar school there. By 1601 his religious views were making him unpopular with the school authorities. He gave up his job, was received into the Church by a Jesuit—most likely not in Yorkshire—and went to the English College at Valladolid, escorting another Yorkshire student and bearing a testimonial from the Archpriest. His course of studies for the priesthood was brief. He passed through Douai on his way to Spain on 28 August 1602, was back at Douai from Valladolid in March 1603 and ordained priest that June. By early September he had reached the English mission. We get two glimpses of him

on the mission—in 1604 or 1605 receiving into the Church a youth at Masham whom he despatched to Valladolid, and in 1609 still listed as on the strength of the Yorkshire mission. James Nightingale was most likely a native of Malton. He came to the mission from Douai in August 1584 and seems to have had twenty uneventful years in Yorkshire. In 1592 the York authorities picked up traces of him. In 1599 he was heard of at Grosmont, Egton and received into the Church his nephew, Richard Nightingale (later at the English College, Rome) at New Malton. He was most likely gaoled and exiled in 1606 and was certainly no longer on the strength of the English mission in 1609. We have met Lancelot Blackburne before as a native of Battersby, Stokesley, and originally a schoolmaster at Topcliffe. After emerging from gaol in about 1579 (we do not know how he regained his liberty), he seems to have worked in the Riding and Derbyshire until he was arrested, laden with 'massing stuff', by Derbyshire Justices in 1587, having just come from Battersby. He was certainly not executed—again we do not know why, though his answers, on examination, were so confusing that there may well have been insufficient evidence. He again regained his liberty and appears on a list of wanted Yorkshire missionaries in 1593. John and Francis Lockwood were the elder sons of Christopher Lockwood of Sowerby, Thirsk, a pardoned rebel of 1569. Their careers in colleges abroad, from their first arrival there as mere boys in 1579, are very obscure, largely because of their profusion of *aliases*. They certainly took their time over their theological course, visiting most of the English colleges—perhaps because they had relatives amongst the exiles of '69. Both were on the Yorkshire mission by 1591 and became solid and enduring bulwarks of it. As we shall see later, John was executed in extreme old age in 1642 and Francis, after living for years quite openly at Stanwick St John, died there in 1637.⁽²⁰⁾

By 1603 we know for certain of only two North Riding Jesuits, though others may already have entered novitiates and scholasticates on the Continent. Charles Tankard was the eldest son of Ralph Tankard of Arden Hall, Hawnby. After a few years at St John's College, Cambridge, he entered the English College,

Rome, in 1583, but when in minor orders left to become a Jesuit at Naples. He completed his theology at the University of Alcala in Spain and in 1592 was minister at the English College of Seville and confessor to the governor of Castile. He died young at Valladolid in about 1598. We get some light on his later career, partly from references to intercepted letters from him and partly from the reports of a spy in Spain, Edward Conyers. (Conyers was Tankard's first cousin, and employed by Sir Robert Cecil.) The other North Riding Jesuit—and the only one on the Yorkshire mission at this period—was Richard Holtby of Hovingham, whom we have already met as a seminary priest in the north of the Riding in 1580-1. In 1583 he left for Flanders to enter the Society of Jesus and was away until January 1590-1 when he landed somewhere on the Durham or Northumberland coast with one companion to start the first permanent Jesuit mission in the north-east.⁽²¹⁾

Thanks to the survival of numbers of their letters and versions of their answers before examining magistrates we are quite well-informed about the mentality of mission priests in these years of strain. It is not possible to work out statistics of the proportions of them who were imprisoned or executed, and, for obvious reasons, we know far more about the martyrs than we do about the quite large number of priests of whom the only evidence is a common surname with the note 'dioc.Ebor'. and dates of ordination and despatch to England in the college registers. With these caveats, we give, for what they are worth, our figures for the North Riding mission: some sixty to sixty-five priests most likely worked there, however briefly, at some time between 1582 and 1603; of these fourteen were caught and martyred, another seventeen are known to have been caught but not executed—and of these four apostatised. Thus we know that about half were caught and about one in four martyred. This accounts for the first evident feature of mission priests' mentality—what we can only call a highly developed devotion to martyrdom. A great many factors must have converged in their minds to forge this; the force of Christian tradition (felt also by Protestants—witness Foxe), the accumulating and powerful

example of their predecessors (William Harrington of Mount St John—'Campion I desired to imitate whom only love of country and zeal for the house of God consumed before his time'; Alexander Rawlins, a missionary in Cleveland—'so manie of my blessed brethren have all readie got the victorie fyghtinge in the same quarrell. . .'), the influence of martyrs' versions of their examinations, last letters and sermons all passed around, copied amongst Catholics and printed by Verstegan and Bridgewater, the accent on martyrdom of the priests' training at Douai, the strong traditional spiritual and moral setting of public executions, the special care Tudor governments took in staging them. All this made powerfully for the very mannered and ceremonious way in which priests met their deaths. Depending on temperaments, some (like Edward Thwing of Heworth's very short letters from his 'pallace of plesure', Lancaster gaol . . . 'passing from an unhappy life to a most happy death', or John Pibush of Thirsk's 'I am willing to lay down many lives, if I had them, for such a cause') were laconic in their liturgical self-oblation, others serene (as William Harrington in his long valedictory letter, surely a choice specimen of Tudor prose, to the Yorkshire Lord Keeper, Puckering—'I protest sincerely to your honour that, after once I had determined this course, which at God's good pleasure and your's I shall consummate, I made no more account of my life or any worldly pleasure, but sleeping and waking death was the continual object of my mind, end of my desires and the greatest honour which in this world I expected as the answer of my long and painful labours . . .'), and others had to fight for self-control in incoherence and introspection—as Alexander Rawlins. A second feature of the priests' mentality was a very sharp spiritual directness, both with their judges and their faithful, expressed in Biblical or very homely images. The sharpest example of this we know was Margaret Clitheroe's gesture with her hands of the gallows, made 'laughing' to her fellow Catholic prisoners in York Castle long before her final trial. But there are scores of other examples—the images of a 'palace of pleasure', a castle of protection against the world, a spiritual retreat, heaven, constantly applied to their squalid

prisons (and so, by transference, to the strait way of life of lay Catholics under persecution), Rawlins' comparison of the Catholic's life to a dying ('I hope I maye saye with manie a happie sole departed in this happie case *Requiescamus in pace* . . . may I obey all man his lawes & cruellties with perfect love & charitie . . . that you who are my charge & swete children may the willinger take thankfullie all sutche plesant punishments as god shall sende you in this wandering wilderness . . .'), their very firm rejection of what was against their consciences (John Nelson of Overton's comment on the established religion—'It is both heretical and schismatical. If the Queen be a setter forth and defender of this religion . . . then she is a schismatic and a heretic'; or Luke Kirby of Richmond's 'That to deny the Pope's authority is denying a point of faith, which I would not do for saving my life, being sure that this would damn my soul. . . . In praying with you I should dishonour God; but if you were of one faith with me, then I would pray with you . . .'; or Alexander Rawlins to Huntingdon—'I sayd it was not for a preeste to be sworne; if it pleased him to take my worde as I shoulde speake it, so it was; if not, I cowlde not mende it, for sweare I wolde not . . .'; and on being told to kneel on both knees before the President throughout his examination—'I sayed I wolde give his honor that which was dewe to his honor, but bothe my knees were dewe to God a lone; if my prince were in place I for my parte wolde give no more than one knee . . . and then he was content with one knee . . .'). A last feature of the priests' mentality was a sharp criticism of the *droit administratif* of the statutes of 1571 and 1586 making reconciliation and entry into England after ordination abroad *ipso facto* proofs of treasonable intent, without regard to any evidence to the contrary. Harrington protested that he had taken an Oath of Allegiance before 'the Commissioners' (we should like to know more of this), had always abhorred treason and could see no justice in 'that late, too severe and to be abrogated or at least mitigated' Statute of 1586. Rawlins told Huntingdon 'I never committed Treason in my life . . . if anie colde accuse me of Treason I wold willinglie suffer for it but I was suer I never entered into anie matter of

State or anie thyng againste our majestie and anie thinge that might be hurtfull to our countrie . . . unless it were treason to be a preeste. But if to be a preeste were to commit treason then by ther Lawe they myghte make me a Traytor, although I was suer by God his lawe it was no sinne at all . . .'.⁽²²⁾

We can only piece together a blurred and, in parts hypothetical, sketch of the organisation of the Yorkshire mission at this period. For a start, it is important to remind ourselves that it was a matter of organising the pastoral work of a yearly average of about twenty seminary priests (twenty-five by 1609) and one Jesuit for some 3,500 Catholics—the Catholic population of a modern large town parish, but scattered over the largest county in England. There was an organisation of a sort as early as the 1570's, but one simply designed to facilitate the passage overseas of priests, boys, information, letters, books and money collected for the colleges abroad. The first seminary priests to enter Yorkshire were under the direction of Cardinal Allen in Rome and received their faculties through him, and ultimately through the *Congregation de Propaganda Fide*. In practice the missionaries once on the seas, were left to their own ingenuity and judgment, and, if in need of advice or help, had to recross the seas to get it. The Persons-Campion mission of 1580–1 perceived the necessity of some on-the-spot superiors and direction, but was unable to supply it. By 1582 Thomas Bell was clearly acting as the *de facto* leader of a group of priests in Yorkshire. The following year there arrived John Mush who had a mandate from Allen appointing him leader. Bell seems to have acted as his assistant for a time and then gone to Lancashire to act as leader there. As the numbers of priests slowly increased, so did the numbers of recusants, and working conditions worsened sharply. The Marian priests were now mostly in gaol, an alarming number of new priests were caught on landing in the south, and the Statute of 1586 made staying in houses perilous. The logical solution was firstly to organise an 'underground' railway debouching into the country by some remote northern port, with an assembly centre whence new priests could be sent to stations; and secondly to establish irregular mission circuits with safe resting-places

for priests. An information of the latter 1580's implies that Mush had established the circuits, with priests travelling in pairs, perhaps as merchant and clerk (which is how Mush and Bell were reputed to travel. At this period, priests were commonly caught in the county in pairs). It is possible that the Privy Council's interest in William Phillipps yeoman of Danby in Cleveland implies that his house was the first rest-centre there. He was arrested in 1580 and perhaps Mush re-established the centre at Grosmont, a farm-house in Egton belonging to the Cholmleys. An information of 1587 says that the impecunious (and ostensibly Protestant) Metcalfe family of Aysgarth were not occupying Nappa Hall and their trustee had let it on lease to two men named Curwen and Teady, papists, who were reputed to be using it 'to entertain priests whereof they are not unfurnished' and that Tyrrell had been seen there. Tyrrell was, as we have seen, Bell's companion. Informers suggested that the Clebornes' house at Killerby near Catterick Bridge, Edward Beseley's house at Overton and the house of one Smithson near Richmond were also in use. It is also clear that Mush established the Middleburgh (Flanders) to South Shields (or Stockton) route. In 1589 two captured priests revealed its secrets—that a house of reception at South Shields was run by one Ursula Taylor. Laurence Kellam (apparently a man who had tried his vocation at Douai some years earlier and left) met priests there and supplied them with money, while George Errington, a gentleman, acted as their guide thence to the gentlemen's houses to which they were assigned. Books came the same way, and were sent on to Newcastle concealed in baskets of fish. Walsingham gave personal attention to this, and the house was raided. This, however, as we shall see, did not put an end to its use by Catholics.

In January 1590-1 the permanent mission in the north-east of Jesuits was established by Richard Holtby. He and Mush, apparently in close concert, continued to expand and improve the existing crude mission organisation. The Middleburgh-South Shields run was retained—South Shields was a property of the Bishop of Durham, and, as so often in Yorkshire, ecclesiastical properties (perhaps because of inefficient supervision by episcopal

or prebendal landlords, then notorious) were used by Catholics as safer than others. Edward Fulthorpe, a Newcastle merchant who had been forced to flee overseas by threats of summons to the Council of the North, took over the organisation at the Middleburgh end. Newly arrived priests were passed from South Shields to Holtby's refuge at Thorneley, Durham, where they were fitted out with portable altars and clothing. They then were moved south to Grosmont Priory, Egton, which was kept by the Hodgson family, tenants of the Cholmleys. A most circumstantial confession by Thomas Clarke, an apostate priest, in January 1592-3, described the lay-out at Grosmont. John Hodgson, the farm tenant, was, according to Clarke, 'sent thither by the said Holtby'—very possibly an exaggeration, since the family had long lived in Egton. From there Clarke explained that he had said Mass at two houses in Egton (Fatherley's and Postgate's), at a farmhouse in Mulgrave, at Mr Tocketts's house at Tocketts, Guisborough, at a poor man's house in Fylingdales, Whitby, at Mrs Katherine Radcliffe's manor house of Ugthorpe and at Mrs Cholmley's manor house at Whitby. Clarke met another priest at Grosmont and once saw Martin Nelson at the Cholmleys' in Whitby. He then, in an additional confession, named no less than thirteen other priests (including John Mush and Alexander Rawlins) whom he claimed to have met at Grosmont during his three months or so there. Of course, there may have been a meeting of missionaries at Grosmont, but the discrepancies between this confession and the first one are sufficient to make us doubt Clarke's details. It is curious that there is no reference to any raid on Grosmont as a direct result of this information. The Hodgsons appear thereafter steadily in presentments for recusancy for many years. John Hodgson was, it is true, summoned to the High Commission about this time, but was not imprisoned and remained a recusant. Mrs Radcliffe was gaoled, but very soon released by influences at Court. Thomas Tocketts, who was not at home, according to Clarke, when he said Mass in his house, was sent to Hull Blockhouses for a year and then, according to Catholic sources, bought his way out. His wife does not seem to have been molested. Mrs Cholmley was gaoled but soon released.

We hear of no charges of harbouring against any of the people whom Clarke accused (though, of course, our sources are incomplete). On the authority of the secretary of the Council of the North, we hear that an official watch was kept on Grosmont from 1597 and a raid planned and actually carried out by Lord Sheffield from Mulgrave Castle in 1599. Grosmont Priory was found completely empty. A rigorous search revealed some Mass kit, and one secret passage down to the 'vaults' under the house. The upper entrance to the passage was opened by twisting the main post at the bottom of the staircase. The vaults interested the searchers because they had been warned by a spy that they communicated with the bottom of the face of the cliff on which the house stood, and so enabled men to get away in boats on the stream which ran at the foot of the cliff. Even after this, we can find no record that John Hodgson or his family were molested.⁽²³⁾

Clarke seems to have been captured at Upsall Castle, and his confession maintained that this was another resting-place for priests, kept by Lady Constable, wife of the owner, the conformist M.P., Sir Henry Constable. As we have already seen, Lady Constable was only narrowly saved by Court influences and a royal intervention from indictment for harbouring, while her brother-in-law, Joseph Constable, was indicted *in absentia* and outlawed. Clarke claimed to have met several priests at Upsall. The castle, like Grosmont, continued to be used by priests after 1593, as we shall see. A capture of priests there in 1609 is recorded, and the fact that it also had a maze of vaults under it as a means of escape away into the countryside. Curiously enough the Constable family owned a second old castle within a short distance of Upsall, at Kirkby Knowle. The use of this had been made over to Joseph Constable and it was here that he himself was caught in March 1597-8. The searchers reported that Kirkby Castle had 'vaults and secret passages both above and below ground', making it a safe place for seminary priests to hide. We are not very well-informed about the use of the manor-house at Whitby for priests in these years. Sir Hugh Cholmley, writing some half a century later, reported the family tradition that the

house, until 1603, was 'a receptacle to the seminary priests coming from beyond seas, and landing frequently at that port; insomuch as, I have been told (the writer was born in 1600), there have been in his house three or four of them together at a time, and, most coming both bare of cloaths and money, have, at his lady's (Lady Cholmley) charge, been sent away with a very great supply of both; some in scarlet and sattin, with their men and horses, the better to disguise their professions'. But there is not much other evidence to suggest that Whitby was a major landing and rest centre. In 1591 Edmund Gennings, Alexander Rawlins (Holby's penitent) and another priest seem to have left it to their Norman shipmaster to set them down at random on the northern coast. He put them ashore on the open beach outside Whitby; they ventured into the town and were questioned and nearly arrested by a pursuivant. They got away to 'a Catholic gentleman's house within two or three miles of Whitby' and dispersed from there. There seems to be no other detailed evidence of priests landing at Whitby, though in 1597 there was an information of five strangers landing at Runswick Bay, and in 1599 Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby wrote darkly in general of the inlets round Whitby. There are informations of only three priests being at the manor house there, all in 1592-3. Clarke, who should have been well-informed about priests' centres, only talks of Whitby as a Mass-centre. If the other apostates who had worked in Cleveland, Mayor and Hardesty, gave information about Whitby as a major disembarkation point we should expect to find evidence of a raid being made on it—and there is no such evidence surviving apparently. The Cholmleys were influential people, but if Whitby really had been a Catholic centre of major importance, it is hard to believe that their influence could have prevented a raid; their property at Grosmont was raided, and so were properties of the still more influential Constable family. (24)

Another rest-centre for priests was certainly established at a place called Thornton Woods, which it is not easy to identify, except that it must have been either in Richmondshire, around Bedale, or in the liberty of Ripon nearby. Thomas Warcopp,

gentleman, was the keeper of the house. His wife was a Gatenby of Gatenby, Burneston, and, at any rate when her husband was in trouble, she and the children lived at Gatenby. The evidence suggests that Thornton Woods was a remote farm or leasehold property, and that Warcopp acted both as host and guide to priests. In 1594-5 he was caught harbouring Alexander Markland, a priest, but Warcopp escaped. Shortly before or after that he was said to have kept a priest called Neal, and early in 1595 he and Alexander Rawlins were caught in his house—and again Warcopp escaped, this time from York Castle. Several of Rawlins's last letters were written to him and give vivid details of Warcopp himself, his fits of melancholy and his ardent desires for a contemplative life, of his wife and children (of whom one was the priest's godchild), of the letters, 'all my books' and the household articles left by the priest in a chest in Warcopp's house. A survey of recusants in 1595 reported that Mrs Ann Warcopp and her family, recusants, were living at Gatenby while her husband, the notorious harbourer and gaol-breaker, was in hiding. He resumed his dangerous work and was caught, for the third time, in 1597 when caring for another priest, William Anlaby, and was martyred with him. His widow was gaoled and was still in York Castle in 1600.

If there were any other North Riding rest-centres, we hear nothing of them. It is true that Anthony Page was caught hiding in the outhouses of Heworth manor-house in 1593 and that Ugthorpe manor house was reputed to house a priest in 1596, but there is no other evidence of priests frequenting these places. No doubt the south of the Riding was served by the centres in York itself and at Osgodby and Grimthorpe in the East Riding. Richmondshire could also be served from centres at Farnham in the West Riding and Nidd in Ripon liberty.⁽²⁵⁾

It was precisely in 1593, the very year in which this organisation began to flower more fully, that there came the first rumbles of the furious dissensions amongst English Catholics which issued in the 'Wisbech Stirs' of 1594, the riots at the English College, Rome, of 1594-8, and the Appellant affair of 1598-1606. A number of separate, but connected, issues were debated furiously:

politico-religious questions concerning the allegiance of Catholics to the Queen and the attitude they should take on the succession issue, questions concerning possible forms of government of the English mission, a renewed burst of the age-old quarrel between secular priests and religious on the mission, issues about the control and running of the seminaries. From the fray there soon emerged two embattled parties. One consisted of a comparatively small group of secular priests demanding a gesture of allegiance to the government and the disowning of plotting against it, the establishment of a bishop over the mission with power to limit the activities of Jesuits—or, at least, that secular priests should be allowed to organise themselves without domination by Jesuits, the placing of all seminaries under the authority of superiors not subject to Jesuits. The other party, of some Jesuits with seminary priest supporters, and also apparently small, regarded this programme as fatally unrealistic and dangerous, though it was never quite clear what they themselves regarded as the ideal solution to the problem. As always amongst minority opposition groups under severe strain (for instance contemporary Dutch Catholics, the Protestant Marian exiles, the Puritan movement) both sides showed extreme violence of language and sometimes of action and personal charges were freely bandied about. The issues were vital, but in fact susceptible of nothing but a compromise solution, which the temper of mind of both parties and, perhaps, the scholastic training they had in common, made it hard for them to swallow. As always, every degree of opinion was held, people shifted their views and it seems that the great majority—to the intense annoyance of the parties—of both Jesuits and seminary priests maintained a puzzled and hesitant *de facto* neutrality. But we are only interested here to exorcise the ghosts of the parties (which still peer disconcertingly over the shoulders of Catholic historians today) and to try to see what evidence there is of an impact of the dissensions on the North Riding mission. The two superiors of the mission in 1593 became rival protagonists in the fight. Richard Holtby seems to have become the northern leader of the 'Jesuit' party. The Appellants charged their opponents with using their control of

the seminaries, their great prestige and their methods of spiritual direction to exercise a dangerous domination over the missions, splitting the missionaries into sheep and goats and excluding the goats from support and the 'residences'. As we have seen, the organisation of the Riding's mission was not started by Holtby, although, from his arrival back as a Jesuit in 1591, his influence was evident in it. At the most he had only two or three other Jesuits under him at this period, none of whom appears to have worked in the Riding. He was the spiritual director of some missionaries. Alexander Rawlins was certainly directed by him and deeply attached to him, though Rawlins's moving last letter to him from York Castle gives us no indication as to whether he had taken a vow of obedience to his director—a not uncommon feature of religious direction at that period. John Mush himself had certainly been under Jesuit direction and was said to have been a postulant of the Society in the later 1580's. He worked closely with Holtby during the years 1591-3, but we have no idea whether he was directed by him. Henry Bell, who (and not Thomas Bell, who soon moved into Lancashire) may have been Mush's assistant and travelling companion in 1592, was under Holtby's wing, as also was John Percy, at that time an ex-Jesuit novice. Bernard Pattinson was a Douai priest who reached the mission in 1586 and was apparently at work with Mush in that year. In 1593 he was thought to have a mission circuit including Richmondshire and his native Co. Durham, and to be using the *alias* of Sicklamore. Although this *alias* was used by others in those years, there is at least a fair likelihood that Pattinson was the John Siclemore, priest, who, in August 1598, wrote a letter to Bagshawe, an Appellant leader, in which he urged the case of the Jesuit party with much force; and that he was the Siclemore, priest, missionary in Yorkshire and Durham, who was reported by a spy in 1606 to be bound by a vow to enter the Society and to be under Holtby's direction. We may perhaps add to the list of 'pro-Jesuits' a seminary priest named Richard Parker, *alias* Smith, reported at Grosmont in 1593 and at Ugthorpe in 1596. A priest of this name was assistant to the Archpriest Blackwell in 1598 and later his agent in Rome—but identification of him with

the missionary is very hypothetical. Then there was Cuthbert Crawfurth, a Durham missionary who was regarded by the York authorities as being 'bishop' of the local mission in 1599 and resident at Grosmont. By this time Mush was suspended by Blackwell and it is quite possible that Crawfurth was appointed superior of the mission by the Archpriest, and that he was well-disposed towards Holtby. At a later stage in the history of the Jesuit-secular controversy, it would be possible to count the pro-Jesuit (or 'Ignatian') group amongst secular priests by tracing those educated, not at Douai, but at Rome or Valladolid. But at this early period such origins were no certain indication of viewpoint, and Rome had its numerous rebels, and Douai its 'Ignatians'. Thus the number of those likely to be directed by Holtby was apparently small—which fits Mush's statement that the pro-Jesuit seculars were a minority ('within our nation ye greater number without comparison, and ye most sufficient & best labourers every way, are not guided thus as you speake of . . .'). We are very ill-informed about the workings of contemporary spiritual direction in detail—indeed, its details were necessarily secret. It certainly included sodalities, private vows of obedience of very various degrees, vows to enter religious Orders, and the possibility of private entry into a religious Order while still working on the mission. Not only Jesuit history at this period, but early English Benedictine history, contain examples of all this. Mush, who had personal reasons, presumably, for knowing, expressly said that the Jesuits had a 'confraternity'.

A common charge by the pro-Jesuit party was that those priests who were not spiritually directed, or, at least, only directed by men who were not themselves 'guided', were in grave danger of sliding into laxity, indifferentism and even immorality. Thomas Bell became, in such literature, the stock example of a Rake's Progress, and it was maintained that, before his complete apostasy in 1592, he had already become an indifferentist, a man of evil life and a government spy. Holtby, at some stage in his quarrel with Mush, accused Francis Stafferton, a North Riding missionary, of open immorality, and Mush hotly defended Stafferton. It was also suggested by the Appellants that the Jesuits

had gained an undue hold over lay patrons and influenced them against priests not of the 'confraternity'. There is a celebrated letter from Mush to just such a lay patron, Wiseman. However we have a letter from Holtby in 1601 for an unnamed 'Lady' (most likely Lady Babthorpe of Osgodby). It is extremely long, goes into great detail on ecclesiastical affairs, and presumes that Mush is her 'friend' and spiritual adviser and has prejudiced her against Jesuits. Moreover, as we have seen, there were few regular lay patrons of priests in the Ridings in the 1590's—perhaps it was this very paucity which caused the trouble. Lastly, the Appellants charged the Jesuits with supporting plots and disloyalty to the government. Charles Tankard was certainly a supporter of the Spanish Armadas and perhaps found a place for John Smithson on the Armada of 1596. Another Yorkshire Jesuit, Thomas Wright, left the Society in 1595 and embarked on a strange private campaign for an agreement between Catholics and the government, a campaign which carried him into the camp of the Earl of Essex, to York in 1599 on parole to disseminate his ideas, and finally into alliance with the wilder of the Appellants. We hear nothing of Holtby's own political views. As for his protégés—Rawlins expressly told Huntingdon that he would never enter into any political action against the Queen, while Warcopp was reputed to have made no answer when asked by his judges if he would pray for the Queen's protection from her enemies.

For his part, John Mush became the acknowledged leader of the northern Appellants and spent the years 1593–1603 in much travelling between Yorkshire, Wisbech and Rome. In spite of hard-hitting in his letters and the lending of his considerable ability unstintingly to the party cause, he was never one of its extremists, and at least one of his letters consists of a moving appeal for unity and a sense of proportion on both sides. He was one of the authors of the scheme to found an Association or Sodality for all seminary priests, a voluntary union to provide support for poor missionaries, a just use of 'residences', and to encourage general confessions, the use of the rosary, and the general spiritual life of priests. Holtby complained that it was a

separatist movement to exclude the pro-Jesuits—Mush retorted that the existing secret Jesuit sodality had acted in precisely that way. What is interesting to us is the domesticity of the quarrel. The protagonists had all received much the same intellectual and spiritual training. In fact, by 1597 Mush was complaining that he would have been willing to start the Yorkshire Association with only ten members, but had been unable to persuade even as many as ten to join. In fact, just as we hear of comparatively few seminary priests absolutely aligned with Holtby, so we hear of few who were prepared to commit themselves completely to the Appellant programme. The secular opposition party at Wisbech in 1594 included two or three Yorkshiremen, but none from the North Riding; the pro-Jesuit group contained Ralph Bickley who may have come from the Riding, and who later became a Jesuit while in gaol. The small Yorkshire group amongst the Appellants proper contained no native of the Riding and only three who had worked there—Mush, William Bishop (an Appellant leader, on the 1598 mission to Rome and later Bishop of Chalcedon; he had been at Grosmont in 1592–3) and John Clinch (at Grosmont in 1593).

It has been alleged that this dispute rent the missions asunder and put an end to real possibilities of great advances by Catholicism in England. The records of the North Riding mission—or of Yorkshire—indicate no such collapse of the mission organisation. The Archpriest Blackwell, appointed by Rome in 1598, seems to have appointed Cuthbert Crawfurth, a missionary in Cleveland, superior of the North Riding, or even Yorkshire, in place of Mush, who was then suspended by Blackwell. Although raids put an end to the Thornton Woods centre, and perhaps rendered Upsall, Kirkby Knowle, Grosmont and South Shields unusable for a time, although apostasies in the Cholmley family closed the main Whitby 'residence' in 1603, these casualties were no more the result of the dissensions than were the losses sustained by capture and conformity during Lord Burghley's offensive against Catholics of 1599–1603. In fact Upsall and perhaps Grosmont, Kirkby Knowle and South Shields were restored to use, and by 1609 there were more priests than ever before on the

Yorkshire mission and more recusants than in 1590. The more general and difficult question as to whether either of the two parties' schemes (rather than the *de facto* compromise of pro-Jesuit and secular missions existing side by side in a difficult alliance under Archpriests with small powers of command) would have greatly improved the fortunes of the Church is in no way helped towards a solution by any of our local evidence. We can only suggest that neither scheme ever had a real chance of success; both required far more general support in England, far more resources and far more diplomatic *expertise* than they were ever likely to have at their command.⁽²⁶⁾

The third general feature of the period 1582-1603 was a marked increase in the number of Catholics in the Riding. The 300 of 1580-2 became some 950 in 1590-5 (including 872 convicted recusants, according to the Assize Judges) and 1100-1200 in 1603. The overall numbers remained extremely small, but that fact was offset by two developments. The first was a widening of the (in 1582) already startlingly large impact made by Catholicism on the landed gentry of the Riding. In 1580-2 there had been 58 gentry families affected in some degree by Catholicism; in 1590-5 there were 110 and in 1603 about 120. This last figure includes 'vagrants' and 'mere gentry' or 'ignobiles', not recognised as armigerous by the Heralds. But in 1603 of some 190-200 armigerous gentry families of recognised standing in the Riding, no less than 71 were affected by Catholicism. The proportion was highest in Richmondshire, where quite half were affected. The other development was the rise of Catholic congregations. The chief of these were (in each case, the first figure is numbers of recusants and non-communicants who can be identified as Catholics with reasonable certainty in 1590-5, the second the same in 1603)—Stanwick St John (31, 105); Whitby Strand (50, 100); Masham (37, 73); Grinton (41, 68); Forcett (47, 60); Kirkby Ravensworth (29, 59); Egton (28, 55); Guisborough (15, 39); Hovingham (24, 36); Brotton (8, 29); Stokesley (2, 29); Lythe (7, 30); Brandsby (19, 20); Kirkby Knowle and South Kilvington (27, 21); Thornton le Street (15, 19); Northallerton (13, 20); Kirkleavington (3, 22); Loftus (7, 20); Danby Wiske

(9, 21); Barningham (5, 22); Middleton Tyas (17, 21); Manfield (6, 20); Crathorne (5, 16). Like most statistics, however, these in themselves give a very incomplete picture of the reality, and we shall get a much fuller and truer one if we survey the wapentakes in some detail.

In Richmondshire, Gilling West was the wapentake with most Catholics. A considerable part of the wapentake then belonged either to the Crown (in demesne of the Honour of Richmond) or to major landowners who lived elsewhere—Lord Scrope, the Earl of Lennox, the Bowes of Streatlam, the Wandesfords of Kirklington and Pickhill. There were only some twelve or thirteen resident local squires. The families of ten of these were affected by Catholicism—in seven cases strongly affected. At most of the houses of these seven, small congregations were coalescing round nuclei made up of the gentry family, married children (it was then the practice for the newly married amongst the gentry often to spend the first years of their life together under the bride's father's roof), relations, poor relation 'servants' and visiting 'vagrants' together with the numerous ordinary house servants. Thus at Scargill until 1602–3 only the womenfolk and servants of the Tunstall family were recusants, but by 1604 the head of the family, Francis Tunstall, Esq., had turned over from non-communicating to recusancy (though he was not yet convicted), there were thirteen recusant servants, a relative, Cuthbert Pudsey, gent., a recusant tutor, two mysterious vagrant visitors 'lately come from beyond the seas', and four recusants outside the house. At Stanwick the two branches of the Catterick family were joined as recusants by Anthony Metcalfe, barrister, of Hood Grange, Kilburn, who, by 1595, acquired an estate at Aldborough in the parish. All three families seem to have stood the persecution of 1599–1603 without flinching. With them were always four or five Catholic relations, and a congregation was forming. At Rokeby, John Rokeby of Mortham Tower and his daughters were recusants in 1590 with Pudsey relatives, but his sons were either absent or conformists. By 1595 John was dead, and his eldest son and heir, Thomas Rokeby wavered into recusancy and conformed, while his wife and most of the rest of

the family were recusants. Thomas was knighted in 1603, but was a recusant again by 1604 and a small congregation formed. At Barforth, Forcett, the Pudsey family seem to have maintained an unbroken front throughout the persecution, the menfolk using to the full the family's houses elsewhere in Richmondshire and in the West Riding and the houses of relations. By 1603-4 a congregation had formed and by 1606—if not before—a priest was maintained in the house at Barforth. At Wycliffe, placed very strategically for Catholics with the Tees at the bottom of the the house garden and Co. Durham within a stone's-throw, the Wycliffe family received much attention from the authorities. In 1583 William Wycliffe was at odds with the parson, who had replaced the Catholic-minded Bartholomew Carus. William was ordered to the Privy Council and seems to have died in a London gaol. His eldest son and heir, Francis Wycliffe, was for years an obstinate fugitive recusant, eventually captured at Kirkby Knowle in 1598. He escaped a charge of harbouring but remained in York Castle to his death there in 1610. His wife and another woman relative were faithful recusants at Wycliffe through all this. Most of his children are to be found as vagrant recusants living in the West Riding, but his eldest son and heir, another William Wycliffe, was an officer in the estate service of the Earl of Northumberland in Northumberland, and seems to have been either a conformist or a very furtive recusant by 1603, though his wife was a recusant. The Girlington family of Girlington in the same parish—but with interests in Lancashire also—did not emerge as recusants here until 1604. Besides these strongly Catholic families, there were a number of recusant wives of conformist husbands—Mrs Jane Gascoigne of Sedbury (who withstood numerous assaults from the High Commission and several imprisonments without flinching), Katherine, wife of Thomas Conyers, Esq., of Gilling, old and poor Mrs Hussey, widow of Thomas Hussey, Esq., of Hutton, Mrs Thoresby of Marrick, Mrs Gower of Melsonby, Mrs Barton of Easby, Mrs Franke of Knighton, the two Mrs Laytons (of West Layton, but living at Gayles in 1592). Finally there was Richard Meynell of North Kilvington, Thirsk, established on his family property at

Dalton, Kirkby Ravensworth, and long hovering on the dividing line between recusancy and conformism, and Anthony Holtby, gent., a vagrant recusant relative of Fr Richard Holtby, S.J., appearing at Marrick in 1601 and as far away as Holderness at other times in this period. It is tempting to imagine that Anthony might have been another Thomas Warcop—after all, the manor house at Marrick then was standing empty and belonged to the recusant Sayers of Worsall. Thus Gilling West, for all that it contained no more than 220 Catholics, comes close to fulfilling the traditional Catholic picture of Elizabethan recusancy.⁽²⁷⁾

At Richmond town it is important to try to sort out what the churchwardens in 1604 called 'papisticall recusants' from other recusants, since, from at least the 1580's the town contained both separatist Puritans and a body of those who avoided church or communicating out of indifference or for moral reasons. Anthony Johnson, the vicar of Richmond, from his institution in the 1580's, had to face a barrage of theological criticism from Puritans. In 1591 he had three parishioners in the High Commission court for seceding from his congregation on the grounds that he taught popish doctrine. Mrs Taylor, the most obstinate of them, was perhaps related to a Recorder of the town, and to a noted Puritan divine who left a fund for the poor of Richmond, excluding 'vicious persons, swearers, drunkards, recusants and idle persons that will not be reformed'. In 1595 one of the Head Burgesses of the town was deposed by the Common Council as long a recusant—yet his name occurs in no list of Richmond Catholics. The Catholic congregation in the town in 1592-5 consisted of sixteen recusants and (perhaps) two or three non-communicants. The core of the recusants consisted of six wives of Protestant husbands, most of whom were prominent in the life of the town—Jane, wife of William Wray of St Nicholas (nephew of Lord Chief Justice Wray), Mary, wife of Roger Gower, Esq., of Melsonby and Richmond (not always resident in Richmond), Ann, wife of Thomas Barton, gent., of Easby; Barbara, wife of Robert Ward, gent., Helen, wife of Richard Crosby, gent. (also not always resident here), and Elizabeth, wife of Richard Willaunce, gent. and draper. Between these gentry and a few labourers

and slaters came a mercer's wife and the Atkinson family, yeomen. It is likely that William Atkinson was the father of a seminary priest, another William Atkinson of Valladolid, who came on the mission in 1596, was caught in London and became a government informer. In 1597 the father was brought before the Privy Council and there (in spite of a lifetime of recusancy which he confessed) conformed completely. The vicar of Melsonby commented that William and a son of his had been 'conveyors of seminary priests' for the past twenty years. It is possible that William had another priest son, Thomas Atkinson the martyr, who worked most of his priestly life in the East Riding. Thomas instructed Robert Watkinson (a future able Jesuit missionary in Yorkshire) at Hemingborough. Watkinson then was sent to school to a gentleman's house in Richmond from 1595-7, until he was ready to go overseas to the English College, Rome. As we have already seen there was another Catholic school in Richmond in 1580, run for the sons of gentlemen by a recusant, Lucy Sedgwick.

We are without evidence on recusancy in Richmond from 1597 to 1604. In the latter year the names of the recusant gentlemen have vanished from the list. There were now only seven 'papisticall recusants' (the wife of Sir William Gascoigne, knight, of Sedbury—the elder son of the obstinate Mrs Jane Gascoigne of Sedbury—the wife of Leonard Beckwith, gent., and three Atkinsons—of whom 'William Atkinson yeoman' must be the apostate father now reconciled to the Church) and a few non-communicants, who may well not have been Catholics. It is interesting that there are three Heighingtons amongst the ordinary recusants and non-communicants—since Robert Heighington of Richmond, the rebel of 1569 and exile in Flanders, had a son William Heighington who (no doubt being brought up abroad) was ordained priest at Rome in 1585. (28)

Gilling East Wapentake contained relatively little land of the Crown's or of great absentee landowners. Of the forty estates of any size here, sixteen at this period belonged to families which were more or less Catholic. Thus the wealthy Catholic Middleton family of Stockeld in the West Riding owned Maunby, Kirkby Wiske and Thirtoft. No Middletons occur in present-

ments here at this period, but we know that they were 'vagrants'. The Radcliffes of Ugthorpe owned Moulton, the Pudseys of Barforth Stapleton and (a little after 1603) Hackforth. There were, besides these outsiders, six resident gentry families more or less Catholic. At Cliffe, Manfield, only ladies of the Witham family were recusants before 1598, when John Witham, Esq., his wife, mother, brother and thirteen others were presented as recusants. Yet in 1604 only the mother and a few servants were listed. It is likely that the rest had conformed temporarily, but quite possible that they had merely moved elsewhere. At Cloubeck in Manfield in 1595 the wife and daughter of Edmund Norton, gent., with the ex-schoolmaster of Manfield were recusants. There is no mention of them either in the lists of 1604, yet they appear steadily in presentments in later years. At Danby Wiske the Conyers family were solidly recusant through the persecution, except for Thomas Conyers, Esq., the head, who conformed under High Commission pressure in 1602, but thereafter remained a non-communicant. At Middleton Tyas the older menfolk of the Franke family conformed under pressure—Christopher Franke only after a period in gaol in 1599—but the women and younger men stood firm. By 1604 one of the conformists, George Franke, was a recusant again. At Moulton the Smithsons, who were 'mere gentry', remained recusants throughout the persecution without molestation, so far as we can see. At Breckenbrough, Kirkby Wiske, the Lascelles family's Catholicism passed through a tunnel of obscurity in these years. Sir Thomas Lascelles, the head of the family, was a complete conformist. But his eldest grandson was to emerge as a definite recusant not long after 1604, and other members of the family were living as recusants or non-communicants in the 1590's as far away as Pontefract, Hemingborough and North Cave. Lastly, Gilling East had the usual crop of 'vagrant' recusant gentry, of whom the most interesting are Cuthbert Witham, gent., at Ainderby Steeple in 1595 (almost certainly a pardoned and attainted rebel of 1569, once of Brettanby nearby), Pudsey younger sons at the family property of Stapleton, a Scrope of Spennithorne wife at Bolton on Swale in 1590.

Hang West Wapentake, with its huge dale parishes, contained much Crown land and was also the centre of Lord Scrope's demesne lands. In the midst of farmers of parcels of these large estates there were only six landowning and resident gentry families of any consequence. Of these, the Metcalfes of Nappa were Protestant, the Broughs of Hauxwell had lost their earlier Catholic tendencies, and the Tophams of Coverham, Wyvills of Constable Burton, Thoresbys of Barden and Scropes of Danby were all at least part-Catholic. Edward Topham senior had been a non-communicant in the 1570's; his son, another Edward, a councillor of Gray's Inn and married to a Scrope of Danby, was a non-communicant and his wife tending to recusancy by 1604-5. Recusancy in the Thoresby family of Barden followed a still more familiar pattern—the head of the family a conformist, his wife a determined recusant, most of the children recusants. They kept this up throughout the persecution, and one son, Thomas Thoresby, was ordained priest in 1600. The Wyvill family, throughout these years, lived on its property at Low Burton, Masham, and kept to the same pattern; both Sir Christopher Wyvill and his eldest son were conformists. At Danby and Spennithorne, Francis Scrope, Esq., was a complete conformist, while his wife (who had left him and lived elsewhere with her relations), his mother (who endured a period of imprisonment in Richmond during Burghley's persecution) and the younger members of the family were almost all determined recusants. Besides the six main families, there were three others regarded with suspicion by the Heralds—the Metcalfes of Bear Park, Aysgarth, the Swales of Grinton and the Waites of Leyburn. The Metcalfes (apparently only very distantly, if at all, related to the Metcalfes of Nappa, their neighbours) were in decline, struggling to keep an estate which they had lost by attainder in 1570 and since then sub-leased from Crown grantees. Roger Metcalfe was a recusant until 1595 and thenceforward a non-communicant, while his wife remained firm. The Swales were a rising and pushing family, whose brief stay amongst the ranks of the squirearchy was to come after 1604. They withstood imprisonment at the hands of Lord Burghley and Solomon Swale and his wife remained

recusants. At Leyburn only the womenfolk of the Waite family were recusants. As usual, Hang West had its share of Catholic 'vagrant' gentry—at Hardraw Mrs Richard Middleton and her servants and Mrs Spence, at Downholme Scropes and Lascelles, at Grinton Gowers and Lascelles, at Spennithorne members of the Eshe family from Co. Durham.

Resident squires seem to have been more numerous in Hang East Wapentake; there were fifteen such families, of which eight were in some degree Catholic, the Lawsons of Brough, Clebornes of Killerby, Metcalfes and Darcys of Hornby, Gírlingtons of Hackforth, Danbys, Wyvills and Normavilles of Masham. There were several other estates belonging to Catholic families seated elsewhere in Yorkshire, estates which occasionally housed recusant junior members of the family—like Bedale (Stapletons of Carlton), Tunstall (Cholmleys), Kirkby Fletham (Methams). At Hornby Thomas Darcy, Esq., did not emerge as a recusant fully until 1604, but his wife and Conyers relations withstood the persecution boldly. Oswald Metcalfe of Hornby and his wife remained non-communicants throughout. John Gírlington of Hackforth and his wife only became recusants in 1603-4. At Catterick Ralph Lawson remained a non-communicant, but the rest of his family were constant recusants. At Masham the male Danbys mostly bent before the storm and either fled or became non-communicants; the Wyvills and Normavilles did the same. As we have already seen, Catholicism in the Cleborne family by this period only affected Mrs Cleborne and her absent priest son. Amongst the few 'mere gentry' and 'vagrants', by far the most interesting are Leonard Calvert and his wife Grace, of Catterick or Bolton on Swale. Both Calvert and his wife seem to have belonged to 'mere gentry' families of small property who frequently held office in the households, or on the estates, of peers. His wife's family seem to have served the Earls of Rutland and Shrewsbury and Lord Wharton; Calvert was an officer of Wharton's. They had been in trouble intermittently for recusancy since 1580. In 1592 the High Commission's special attention seems to have drawn to them by the discovery of what appeared to be a Catholic school in the house of an unidentified Robert

Kay of Linton. The master was one Nicholas Anderson, who taught from the 'popish primer' a class which certainly included Leonard Calvert's sons, George and Christopher, and the son of another recusant, George Lascelles, gent., of Healaugh Park. The schoolmaster, who was, no doubt an old man, was treated with leniency, but his school was broken up. Calvert and his wife were put on bond to conform, to buy within a month a formidable list of books (including a Book of Common Prayer, an English Bible, Nowell's Catechism 'and one other booke as Calvins Institucions, Dtor. Bilsons booke, Ursinus Catechisme or D. Reynolds conference with hart, to ly open in his house for every one to read and to provide for his children Nowells catechisme in Latyn or greeke as their scholemaister shal appointe . . .'). Moreover Calvert was put under a further bond to send his sons to a Protestant tutor, Mr Fobrey, at Bilton in the West Riding, and to parade them before the Commissioners once a quarter until further notice for their progress in Protestantism to be examined. Calvert himself soon certified his full conformity, but his wife, after starting to go to church, refused to communicate, was briefly gaoled in York in 1593 without result, and eventually let go by the Commissioners without further action. As we shall see later, Grace Calvert reappears once in presentments, in 1624, as a non-communicant at Bolton on Swale, while her son, George Calvert, was later to become first Lord Baltimore.

A good deal of buying and selling of land took place throughout Richmondshire during the 1590's, but nowhere to such an extent as in the small wapentake of Hallikeld. Very prominent amongst the speculators were the Cecil family and a courtier, Sir Richard Theakeston, who, as we have already seen, was ready to do jobbery on behalf of Catholics. There seem to have been six resident squires, of whom only one, Thomas Tankard of Brampton, Kirkby Hill, was a Catholic. His family withstood the persecution solidly, and so did he, apart from one lapse from the presentments, in 1595, which may have been due to flight. There were four Catholic families amongst the minor gentry and farmer-gentry—the Gatenbys of Gatenby (an apparently declining

family), the Mitchells of Newton (solidly recusant from at least 1600), George Jackson, Esq., and his family at Burneston (probably farmers, solidly recusant 1595-1604) and Richard Meynell of Pickhill, an emigré from North Kilvington, who was a recusant at least from 1602.

It is clear from this survey of Richmondshire Catholicism that occasional conformity or non-communicating was exceedingly common amongst the heads of gentry families and their heirs, and that a reported comment of John Mush, in August 1592, is very accurate—'the gents were much fallen of, But the gentlewomen stode stedfastlye to yt . . .'. Moreover, in such families, the influence of the women and the real convictions of their husbands are best revealed by the numbers of recusants amongst their children, servants and tenants.⁽²⁹⁾

Allertonshire, geographically, formed a bridge between Richmondshire and upper Cleveland, both areas of Catholic strength, and was itself well endowed with Catholic gentry. Like Ripon liberty, it was an ecclesiastical peculiar, in which a bishop (here the Bishop of Durham) was a large landowner. Unlike Ripon, the jurisdictional powers of the bishop amounted to little and the stewardship was of little account. The lands of the bishop and of other large absentee landlords—the Crown, the Earl of Lennox—were let to farmers. Of the ten or eleven resident families of squires, no less than eight were affected by Catholicism, and a number of other small estates belonged to Catholics who lived elsewhere (Little Leake to the Leptons of Kepwick, Hutton Conyers and Over Dinsdale to the Mallorys of Ripon, Little Smeaton to the Grimstons of Grimston Garth in the East Riding). Two families of squires, then ostensibly Protestant, the Dawneys of Sessay and Pinckneys of Nether Silton, had Catholic connections, the Dawneys Catholicism in their recent past and the Pinckneys recusancy to come soon after 1604. At Hutton Bonville the Conyers family maintained an almost completely recusant front throughout the persecution of these years. At Thornton-le-Street the Meynells did the same, though some younger sons were liable to lapse into occasional conformity, while the Talbots had a very similar history. At

Worsall the Sayers behaved in precisely the same way, while at Leake the heads of the Danby, Greene and Jackson families temporised. At North Otterington Valentine Metcalfe was a conformist while his womenfolk were steadily recusant. At Kirkby Sigston Richard Best, the farmer of the rectory, was a rather furtive recusant along with his wife. At Sockburne, strategically placed athwart the Tees, with their mansion in a loop of the river in Co. Durham and most of the manor in Yorkshire, the Conyers family remained pretty solidly recusant. Yet, for all this, the total number of recusants and non-communicants in Allertonshire had reached no more than eighty-four by 1604.

The great Wapentake of Langbaurgh (Cleveland) counted as almost equal to Richmondshire in its addiction to popery. Yet when we count presentments for recusancy and non-communicating we find these rough figures:

	1590-5	1603-4
East Langbaurgh	70	131
West Langbaurgh	153	214
Whitby Strand	50	100
	<hr/>	
Totals	273	445
	<hr/>	

Part of the total is accounted for by the Catholic squires. Langbaurgh contained a good many fragments of great landowners' estates, farmed out, and a very considerable amount of buying and selling of land took place here between 1580 and the middle of the seventeenth century—usually to the benefit of York and London speculators or great landowners who were outsiders. In the midst of all this welter of change there were some twenty families of resident squires, themselves usually hanging on grimly to the fruits of patient speculation by their immediate ancestors. Some were slowly declining in wealth (like the Radcliffes of Mulgrave and Ugthorpe), others seemed stationary (like the Crathornes of Crathorne), and yet others were improving their position (like the Chaloners of Guisborough—newcomers—and the Yowards of Stokesley and Westerdale and the Constables of

Dromondby). Of these twenty families, eleven were more or less Catholic. The Gowers of Stainsby resorted to vagrancy and (the men) to occasional conformity at the start of the persecution, but by 1600-4 the family was becoming fairly solidly recusant. Robert Yoward, steward of Lord Eure at Stokesley, was a conformist, but his wife and daughter were constantly recusant, moving between Stokesley, Westerdale and Great Ayton. The male Crathornes were conformists until 1601 and thereafter the family became solidly recusant. The head of the Tocketts family of Tocketts, Guisborough, only emerged as a recusant in 1604, but most of the rest of his family had been very determinedly recusant and had endured a good deal of imprisonment and fining. Ralph Salvin of Egton was a conformist throughout this period, though his wife and some of his children were constant recusants. At Ugthorpe headship of the Radcliffe family had fallen to the spinster, Katherine Radcliffe. She maintained her recusancy with great determination, through several imprisonments, though the other members of her family were only emerging cautiously as recusants by 1601-4. At Marske no Rokeby was presented for recusancy at any time during these years—apparently because the recusant members of the family took shelter in vagrancy. At Acklam William Strangways was a Protestant but his wife a consistent recusant. At Marton the male members of the Wildon family only followed their womenfolk into recusancy by 1604-5, though Thomas Wildon, the head, remained a conformist. At Skelton Castle Robert Trotter and his wife first emerged as non-communicants in 1603-4 as persecution eased. At Hutton Rudby John Ingleby of Lawkland, West Riding, himself a constant recusant, only came into residence in later life after 1602. Besides this, of the apparently Protestant families, the Conyers of Whitby and Bowlby, descendants of a business-like steward of Whitby Strand, may have had an old Catholic aunt in Whitby in 1600, and certainly were keeping recusant servants. Then there were numbers of Catholic 'mere' or decayed gentry, like the Fulthorpes (found as vagrants in several places), the Readmans of Mulgrave (who sold their lands in 1597 and became part of Katherine Radcliffe's sizeable collection of poor relations and

pensioners), the Smiths of Lealholm and Egton Bridge ('very rich' yeomen who never quite made the armigerous class), the Wrights of Maltby, Mrs Hargill of Danby. The biggest collections of vagrant gentry were at Ugthorpe and Egton and Whitby (Lady Ann Neville at Ugthorpe in 1590, two Fulthorpes, the Readmans, the Hardings, Henry Thorney, gent.).

However the households and servants of these squires do not account for more than two-thirds of the numbers of Catholics in Cleveland. The other third existed mostly in pockets in the coastal villages like Loftus and Brotton, and were poor fishermen and labourers. The presentments, in a few cases, make it clear that some of these were Catholics. We might feel disposed to wonder whether most were not simply 'mislikers', independent-minded people not subject to the scrutiny of any squire—rather than Catholics. But the evidence of Clarke, the apostate priest, in 1593, makes it very clear that the Grosmont priests had made converts amongst these 'unattached' poor (. . . he hathe heard the confessions of a great manie whereof the moste were poore folkes . . .'). It would be wrong to think of the poor Catholics of Cleveland as existing at all, and continuing to exist, because the authorities could not get at them in their isolation behind the moors. Most of the Catholic squires were fully occupied in dodging the law themselves and had no effective means of protecting any very few Catholic tenantry they might have; even the Cholmleys could not prevent the authorities giving Whitby Strand a close attention. Geographical isolation could not shelter the Catholics, especially after 1596-7, when Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby moved into Hackness and Lord Sheffield into Mulgrave Castle. The determination of the poor Catholics under considerable pressure from York, and the independent spirit they showed (witness the Catholic 'players of interludes' of Egton, whom we shall discuss later, and the violent resistance to sheriff's deputies and pursuivants in 1599) owed at least as much to their own spirit and to their priests as to the support of the gentry.⁽³⁰⁾

Although the Cholmleys were the owners of most of Whitby Strand. Hackness (Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby) and Sneaton were not theirs, and in Whitby itself there were several islands

of independent property—Aislaby (the Dacre estate), Dunsley (a cadet branch of the Fairfaxes of Gilling), Bagdale Hall (the Conyers of Bowlby) and half of Ugglebarnby (a variety of rapidly-changing owners). The court-book evidence and the *Memoirs* of Sir Hugh Cholmley combined give us some picture of the recusancy of the family, but a picture in which there remain obscurities. In 1590-2 the Whitby house was clearly dominated by the matriarch, Lady Catherine Scrope (widow of Sir Richard Cholmley, and using her title, acquired by her first marriage, as was customary then and long afterwards), who was a recusant along with her daughter-in-law, Margaret Cholmley, her daughter, Katherine Dutton, most of the Strangways family (less its head, James Strangways, Esq.) of Sneaton and the Cholmley tenants of Fyling Hall, the Aislaby family. In 1592-3 the full force of the High Commission was bent on Mrs Cholmley and Mrs Dutton, who were gaoled and conformed. Yet by 1596 Lady Scrope (untouched, no doubt because of her age and powerful connections) headed a still larger group of recusant gentry, now including her son, the head of the family, Henry Cholmley, his wife Margaret (reconciled), Mrs Dutton (reconciled), the Fairfaxes almost entire and a heterogeneous collection of 'vagrants', mostly from the Cholmley estate in Thornton-le-Dale. It was at this time that the Hoby assault on the Cholmley jurisdiction over the Strand was being started in the London courts, and a furious family quarrel also raged between Henry and the Catholic heirs of his much elder and disinherited brother, Roger Cholmley of Brandsby. In 1598 Lady Scrope died and the menage at Whitby fell asunder, Henry and his wife moving to Roxby and the Duttons becoming vagrants elsewhere. In 1599 began the persecution of Lord Burghley, the raid on Grosmont (a Cholmley property), and an intensification of Hoby's assault on the jurisdiction—which piled up to a crescendo by 1605 (when Hoby really seemed to have won the day) and was only settled in the Cholmleys' favour by 1609 or later. In 1600-1 came the involvement of Richard Cholmley, Henry's eldest son, in the Essex 'revolt', his imprisonment and humiliating escape. This Richard may have been a vagrant recusant in 1590-5 and

was certainly dubbed Catholic-minded in 1601. Then, at some indeterminate date, presumably between 1601 and 1603, both Henry and his wife Margaret conformed fully, Henry was knighted in 1603 and Richard raised to the North Riding Bench. By this time Whitby recusancy was larger than ever in overall numbers, but of gentry only contained the Fairfaxes of Dunsley, Aislabys of Fyling and Mrs Strangways of Sneaton. Sir Hugh, in his *Memoirs*, would have us believe that the family's rejection of Catholicism started in 1598 with Lady Scrope before her death, and that Henry and Margaret became strong Protestants from 1603. But we may reasonably infer from the other evidence that the change was a great deal more gradual than he wished to believe. Henry and his son Richard were, with some justice, accused of tenderness towards local Catholics long after 1603. Ursula Cholmley—apparently a Brandsby relative, and a strong Catholic—was ensconced on their Eskdaleside property (or was it hers?) after 1603. Richard's sister, Barbara Cholmley, in February 1601 married Thomas Bellasis of Newburgh clandestinely. The circumstances of the marriage were odd and unexplained, and Thomas certainly became a Catholic briefly soon afterwards. It is certainly true that presentments of the family cease abruptly and finally in 1596, and that the rest of Richard's brothers and sisters seem to have made non-Catholic marriages.⁽³¹⁾

An almost complete veil of obscurity lies over the religious state of Scarborough in the 1590's. At any period, presentments sent to the outside world were scanty and formal, and very few Scarborough records survive for these years. The town seems to have contained few gentry—branches of the Lacys and Conyers turned mariners or merchants, and a few customers. Patronage in the town lay with the Protestant Gates family (the keepership of the Castle), with the Lord High Admiral, Lord Eure and (at any rate by aspiration) Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby. A brisk commercial war was going on with Whitby and the Cholmleys. It is hard to believe that there were more than an occasional Catholic recusant or non-communicant in the town.

The liberty of Pickering Lythe contained extremely few

Catholics. A large proportion of it was owned by the Crown, ecclesiastical landlords, the very Protestant Gates and Etheringtons, the Cholmleys and the Suffolk Cornwallises, and, at this period, land was changing hands fast. The only Catholic groups—and they were very small—existed in and around Pickering and at Thornton-le-Dale. At Pickering (where the Protestant Sir Henry Gate was steward) Catholic influences stemmed from Richard and Katherine Dutton, who had a small inheritance there from the Cholmleys. But the Duttons were remarkably peripatetic throughout this period, moving around Whitby, Goathland, Knaresborough, Dalby, Roxby. In 1590 they were temporarily in the Pickering area and maintaining a recusant tutor. The ex-Rievaulx granges on the Pickering marshes, now belonging to the Cholmleys, were not Catholic centres. At Thornton-le-Dale, where the Cholmleys spasmodically occupied their original home at Roxby, the Catholic influences seem to have centred less on Roxby than on the very determinedly recusant Mrs Hunter. By 1603 Goathland was beginning to acquire a small Catholic group of farmers, some of whom seem to have been sub-tenants of a farm held there by Katherine Radcliffe of Ugthorpe, and the rest possibly affected by the Duttons. At Ryton, Kirkby Misperton, existed one of the very few genuine squires in the Lythe, William Percehay. His family's Catholicism was an extremely well-guarded secret. Presentments for the parish are few, and there is only one of the Percehays at this period—William himself as infrequently to church, in 1590. Yet in 1604 his son Richard was admitted to the English College at Valladolid, and explained that his parents were schismatics and his brother a Catholic. Richard himself, who was only fourteen years old, had been received into the Church by a Jesuit—most likely at a Jesuit school in Flanders.⁽³²⁾

Birdforth wapentake also abounded in fragments of great estates, and saw a good deal of rapid turnover of land. Amongst the farmers of others' land, there were apparently some sixteen or seventeen families of the squirearchy, of which eight were in some way touched by Catholicism. The Bellasis family of Newburgh Priory, emigrés from Co. Durham, owed their first foot-

hold here to a grant of monastic land to the nephew of Anthony Bellasis, a chaplain of Henry VIII. By the 1590's they were normally resident at Newburgh and engaged in a highly successful—if not spectacular—consolidation of their land-holdings; they already ranked amongst the dozen wealthiest gentry families in the county. Hitherto recusancy or non-communicating had been confined to junior members of the family in Durham and their wives. In 1600 Thomas Bellasis, the heir, was married in odd and clandestine circumstances to a Cholmley of Whitby, and in 1603 his uncle, James Bellasis, was presented for non-communicating at a Cholmley property in the West Riding. In themselves, these incidents were very trivial and might easily be judged no proof of Catholicism. But, as we shall see later, Thomas hovered on the margins of the Church throughout the rest of his life and died a Catholic. At Hawnby the younger sons of the Meynells were obstinately recusant throughout the persecution, while Ralph Tankard of Arden and his wife were recusants in 1590. At Kirkby Knowle Joseph Constable (whose career we have already described) and his wife appeared intermittently in their vagrant recusant life, which ended in part-conformity by Joseph under severe pressure, but the rest of the family remained strongly Catholic. At South Otterington a cadet branch of the Talbots of Thornton-le-Street provided a lay martyr and a recusant woman during this period. At Kilburn on his ex-monastic farm of Hood Grange Gilbert Metcalfe and his wife remained obstinate throughout the persecution, though he was gaoled in York at least twice. At Sutton under Whitestone Cliff Lawrence Brand (a relation and perhaps son of a former Clerk of the Peace for the Riding) and his wife both conformed under strong pressure in 1592, but he emerged again after 1604 as a 'recusant and seducer of others' in the Thirsk neighbourhood. At Mount St John in the same parish, Henry Harrington (who was most likely a brother of the martyr priest, William Harrington) received priests furtively but was himself ostensibly a conformist, while his wife Petronilla conformed temporarily in 1591. Around 1603 the family moved back to York and there resumed their marginal Catholicism. At Angram Grange, Welbury (and not Angram

Grange in Coxwold, as has sometimes been supposed), a 'mere gentry' family, the Bowes, on their small ex-monastic grange, had produced a lay martyr (Marmaduke Bowes) and sheltered a priest, but had not entered the presentments by 1603. Soon after that year they became open recusants. The Lockwood family of Sowerby, Thirsk, appear nowhere in presentments or court cases for recusancy in these years, though they were to emerge again as strong recusants by the middle of James I's reign. Apart from this Birdforth contained two other interesting cases. The first was the fleeting appearance at Topcliffe (probably at the Mallory property of Rainton) as recusants of a famous group of West Riding vagrants—William Ingleby of Ripley, his wife and son John, and the Malham family of Elslack in Craven. The second case concerned the Readshaws of Coxwold. Roger Lee of York, an ex-fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and physician to the Earl of Shrewsbury, started medical practice in York in the later 1560's. By 1569 he was accounted one of the most violent papists in the county, a rebel leader, and a partner in popery with the equally famous Dr Thomas Vavasour of York. Whereas Vavasour remained faithful to his death, Lee seems to have conformed completely, though his wife remained an obstinate recusant. Mrs Lee, a daughter of the strong recusant Thomas Tankard of Brampton, had originally been the wife of Christopher Readshaw of Oulston, Coxwold. In 1593 her son by Christopher, William Readshaw, now the owner of Oulston, was married secretly—pretty certainly by a Catholic priest—to Alice Wright of Plowland, Welwick, in the East Riding, in the house of Marmaduke Ward of Mulwith, Ripon (the father of the famous Mary Ward). In 1599 the High Commissioners dealt with the marital troubles of the Readshaws. Alice was accused of adultery; the sureties to her bond were her relative, John Wright of Welwick and Thomas Percy of Alnwick Castle—the plotters of 1605. In 1601 William Readshaw (who now called himself Tankard) sold Oulston to Henry Bellasis and we lose sight of the family. Presentments from Coxwold had only once mentioned a Readshaw—in 1590, for non-communicating. In fact this glimpse of the Catholic underworld is only partial, for Mrs Lee was prose-

cuted in the York courts for recusancy by her wild Protestant brother, Charles Tankard of Whixley (and escaped on a plea that it was not fitting to accept the accusation of so close a blood-relative), and her two daughters by Dr Lee were brought up Catholics and both, according to the anonymous York Catholic chronicler of the 1590's, 'turned out badly'.

Landowning conditions in the very large wapentake of Bulmer were as elsewhere, though there seem to have been as many as thirty resident squires. Of these families nine were affected by Catholicism. The Cholmleys of Brandsby followed the familiar pattern; wives and occasional menfolk who were not heads of the family or heirs were solidly recusant through the persecution; the rest were conformists. The same was true of the Wildons of Mowthorpe, Hungates of Sandhutton, Bossall, and Beseleys of Skelton, Overton. A higher degree of obstinacy was shown by the Metham men at Wigganthorpe in 1593-4 and the Holmes of Huntington from 1602. Other familiar, weaker patterns appear at Whenby (Bartons) and Dalby (Whalleys), where steadily conformist husbands had equally steadily recusant wives, at Brafferton (where Mrs Elizabeth Thynne declined by degrees through the persecution, from strong recusancy to occasional conformity) and at Heworth, where a mother and daughter bore the brunt of persecution, while the head of the family, William Thwing (a 'dangerous recusant') fled to Lancashire and conformed there, and quite numerous other members of the family wandered as vagrant recusants over the county. The Fosters of Earswick reproduced a pattern more familiar from tradition. The founder of the family, John Foster the coroner, and his wife Agnes remained recusants all of their lives from at least 1577 until his death in about 1592 and hers after 1614. Their son, Seth Foster, was a Bridgettine in Flanders. His elder brother, the heir, William Foster was thrice married. His second wife, Isabel, was a daughter of the East Riding lay martyr, Richard Langley of Grimthorpe, and she herself died a recusant in gaol in York in 1587. But William remained a complete conformist. Two of his sons, Thomas and Seth, went overseas to become priests. According to Seth, his father and stepmother were schismatics, until

his father was converted by Fr Richard Holtby, S.J., and, as a widower, left to live in Flanders. The conversion must have been after 1604 (when William was presented as a conformist with recusant servants).

Ryedale wapentake contained very few Catholics, and half of them lived in the parish of Hovingham. The existence of this strong Catholic group there was made easy by the fact that the parish contained no less than eleven manors. They were owned almost entirely by separate gentry families. It appears that, in 1563-70, two outsider landowners, Sir John Atherton from Lancashire and Sir Robert Worsley of Cheshire, made moves towards consolidating large estates in the area. Had either persevered, since both seem to have been strong Protestants, Catholicism in Hovingham might well have been weak. However, neither seems to have persevered; the Atherton estate was soon sold off, and the Worsley heir, another Robert, simply acquired the two head manors and sold two others within the parish which his father had bought. Moreover Robert Worsley, who was a very determined Protestant, keeper of the New Fleet prison for recusants at Salford and commissioned to seek out recusants to ensure their conviction, was (as we have already seen) far too preoccupied with his affairs in Cheshire, until his death in about 1603, to reside at Hovingham. By 1590, of the nine non-Worsley manors, three belonged to landlords who can have taken little interest in the affairs of the parish, and the remaining six all belonged to families which were at least Catholic in tendency. Thus the Holtbys owned Scackleton manor and leased the tithe 'manor' of Fryton. George Holtby's wife was an occasional conformist (once gaoled) from 1590, while others of the family seem to have been vagrant recusants elsewhere in the county. In 1600 Fr Richard Holtby, S.J., must have visited his brother George. During the years immediately following this, most of the family came out openly as recusants, and two boys were found Catholic schooling and places at St Omer. Similarly the Bullocks of South Holme and Wildons of the ex-monastic Scackleton Grange, whose menfolk had temporised during the persecution, became quite fully recusant by 1604. The manor of East Ness in

Hovingham belonged to the Catholic Crathornes of Cleveland and acted as a dower house for them, and Coulton belonged to the Fairfaxes of Gilling, then well-disposed towards Catholicism.

At Helmsley, a head-manor of the Earl of Rutland's estate, the only gentry were the Earl's officers (Manners and Croslands) and the Laytons of Sproxtton—who sold out to the Earl at this period. From 1590 to 1596 John Crosland and his wife were non-communicants and entertained vagrant Catholic relations and friends, while the Laytons were recusants. When John Crosland died in 1598, his two daughters were married to Catholics, and his wife, remarried to a conformist, William Ashley, remained a non-communicant in Helmsley. Their only son, another John Crosland and his wife were conformists. At Gilling Thomas Fairfax, one of the dozen wealthiest gentry in the county, and himself knighted in 1603 and a Councillor of the North, had a very determinedly recusant wife. By 1603, however, this had created no Catholic household or group at Gilling. Lady Fairfax had two or three Catholic maids, who were normally housed at Walton near Tadcaster. There were various Catholic cadet branches of the family, but none lived near Gilling. At East Newton, Stonegrave, the women of the Thornton family were steady recusants but the men non-communicants. Their close neighbours at Stonegrave, the Butlers, conformed since 1580, in 1604 reappeared as non-communicants. At Malton there were half a dozen minor gentry families, mostly owning small properties outside the town or serving the Eure family. Three of these families, all apparently independent of the Eures, had Catholic connections. The Lambtons, cadets of a great northern family, had been established in the Malton area since the first years of the century, at first on farms held of Malton Priory, and then on a small property or farm at Amotherby, where they probably lived until at least 1585. They never appear in presentments, and the priest-martyr of the family, Joseph Lambton, must have been an individual convert. He entered the English College, Rome, in 1589. The Raysins of Malton and Broughton, Appleton-le-Street had wavered on the edge of recusancy since the 1570's. Marmaduke Raysin, gent., a non-communicant from 1590 to at least 1596, appears to

have conformed by 1600, but his wife was still a non-communicant in 1604. The Watsons of Malton and Appleton conformed finally by 1591-2. At Muscoats, Kirkdale, the Bullock family, and at Cawton, Gilling, the Rosses—both later strongly recusant families—made their first small appearances in presentments by 1603-4. Vagrants were very few in Ryedale—the Thwaites of Marston in the Ainsty, who appeared in force at Helmsley in 1595, and Henry Bulmer and his wife of Keldholme Priory, Kirkby Moorside, in 1590. Conyers Savile, Esq., the last of his family to own Welburn Hall, Kirdkale, was a non-communicant in 1596.

This rather laborious survey at least has the merit of giving us some indications of the weaknesses and strengths of North Riding Catholicism when facing its most severe test between 1559 and the nineteenth century. Apart from the fewness of priests and their divisions, the most obvious weaknesses were the inability to make real headway with the population at large and the very high proportion of lapses. Of some seventy families of gentry affected by Catholicism, no more than nine seem to have a record clear of lapses, and in very many the impact of Catholicism on the family was still tenuous—in terms of numbers affected in the family and degree of recusancy. If we look at Catholicism in the Riding in terms of social status and wealth (treading carefully because of the enormous gaps in our knowledge of the true economic state of most of them), it would seem untrue to say that Catholicism was the religion of the old and declining gentry. The 'Catholic' gentry were a pretty representative large slice of their kind in Yorkshire, containing those of old coat armour and newcomers, the pushing and the declining, and the general composition of the Catholic gentry body by wealth—a few with incomes of over £1,000 a year (Darcys, Danbys, Fairfaxes, Bellasises, possibly the Cholmleys of Whitby), a moderate sized 'middle class' and a large bloc of very modest gentry—must have corresponded with the social and economic composition of the county gentry as a whole. All were notably on the defensive economically at this period—but so, presumably, were all the gentry. The indigent Catholics (e.g. Frankes of Knighton, reputed

by the Heralds in 1585 to be bankrupt, Metcalfes of Bear Park, Radcliffes, Fulthorpes, Greenes of Newby, Lascelles and Lockwoods) could be paralleled in non-Catholic society. Their religion does not seem to have prevented the Pudseys, Metcalfes of Hood, Meynells of Kilvington, Lawsons, Jacksons of Knayton, Swales and Inglebys of Rudby from the practice of the law, or the Yowards, Croslands and Wycliffes from estate agency. The strengths of North Riding Catholicism were its wide dispersion amongst the gentry, the steadfastness of the women and young of the gentry, the fact that the lapsed regularly returned to the Sacraments, the small but solid pockets of poor Catholics, especially in coastal Cleveland and the undoubted effectiveness of the seminary priests' mission in the slow uphill war against conformism.

We owe the vast majority of what we know of the mentality and personal lives of Yorkshire Catholics of this period to the materials collected at the time by priests like John Mush, Richard Holtby and Anthony Champney, and very little has yet been discovered to add to that. The devout recusant clearly sought spiritual direction. Mush himself, the opponent of Holtby, was—to judge from his *Life of Margaret Clitherow*—no opponent of Jesuit methods of direction. He notes with approval that Margaret 'utterly forsook her own will and judgment in all her actions, to submit herself to the judgment, will and direction of her ghostly father' and thought guidance by directors 'the only safe way to please God'. But she was fortunate in living in York where priests were always passing. A devout Catholic like Richard Danby of Masham and South Cave admitted to the High Commissioners that he had himself baptised all of his six or seven children. The commonplace book of Thomas Meynell of Kilvington also seems to imply that the presence of a priest was a very intermittent feature of his life. Cleveland Catholics in need of a priest to marry them could go as far afield as Billingham on Tees or 'a field' in Lincolnshire. Even Margaret Clitherow relied a great deal on books (though she cannot have read easily and knew no Latin)—the Rheims New Testament, the *Imitation*, and Perin's *Exercise*—and learned the Latin Little Office of our Lady by heart.

Mush comments that this last detail must have been due to her desire to be a religious. But the Catholic country gentry must have been long accustomed to liturgical forms of prayer at home. Thomas Meynell's favourite private prayers seem all to be drawn from Primers or the Office. A Protestant could talk of Church-papists as 'Lady Matins' people. The standard bond for recusants obliged them to have the Book of Common Prayer offices on several weekdays, as well as Sundays, and that must have been a Protestant form of an ancient practice. At Hornby Castle Thomas Darcy fulfilled his bond by getting a household servant to read the services. Thomas Meynell's verses to his wife written while in Hull Blockhouse in 1600 read like a schoolboy's exercise, but are moving—even in his reference to 'the bell', a prize in horse-racing, to which he was much addicted:

. . .Yf wth swete Jesus we would dwell,
 Then must we learne for him to dy:
 Confesse, and then we please him well,
 None can be saved that do deny:
 My lovelie Lord of Love the Well,
 Of al trewe Lovers beares the Bell . . .

His main devotions were to all the virgin martyrs and to our Lady especially, like his relative, Elizabeth, wife of George Holtby of Hovingham, who contradicted the High Commissioners—'saying also that she wold praye to the Virgyn Marye and wold not any waye be brought from that erronyous opinion . . .' (33)

The mind of the Catholic of the lower classes has to be judged from actions rather than reported words. A few details survive. At Egton, John Hodgson—either the keeper of Grosmont Priory, or his son—was thought by the churchwardens to 'perswade her maty subjects from the church ther reason is this, his brother James wife being married about three yeares agoe to the said James Hodgson was then a very good protestant but nowe of late by their meanes did not come to the church nor communicate who being excommunicate since Easter day last was this Xmas delivered of a child and in great danger of death the said John Hodgson did rede unto her exhorting her as we learned after the popish manner and the said Katherine departing the said John



George Calvert of Kiplin, 1st Lord Baltimore. (Daniel Mytens. With acknowledgments to the Earl Fitzwilliam and the Royal Academy.)

together with all or most of the recusants of the Chappelry did come with the corpse of the said Katherine in the dawning of the day having gotten the church key into the church and buried the said Katherine without any minister . . .'. At Egton also in 1595 were Robert Simpson, cordwainer, and Christopher Cordiner, both 'players of interludes about the country'. This is the first reference we have found to one or several small companies of rustic actors, mostly Cleveland recusants, who seem to have flourished down to the Interregnum. The—to us all too shadowy—background to this was country dancing, piping and rush-bearing plays and mimes, which crop up periodically in presentments, and which were probably also the background to the rhymes, rumours and prognostications of 1559–1569. In 1601–2 Michael Steel of Skelton in Cleveland was being tormented by a set of gentry headed by the ever quarrelsome Meynells of Hawaby, and most of them with a faintly Catholic background. The tormentors spread libels about Steel, getting players of interludes to set them to rhyme and music and sing them as 'Jigs' at the end of their plays at Osmotherley and elsewhere. So respectable a Justice as Sir William Bellasis of Newburgh had sent over a servant privately to get a copy of the Jig for his own delectation. The whole case was taken to the Council of the North and eventually to the Star Chamber—where the prosecution alleged that editions of the Jig made after the accession of James I had added an 'undersong' of political and religious comment. We should probably be not far wide of the mark if we connected all this with the case of Sir Thomas Hoby *v.* the Eures, with the Eures' comic imitations of the Hoby family's Puritan psalter—which, when rehearsed privately before Sir Robert Cecil himself, reduced him to tears of laughter. We shall meet the Egton interlude players again later, with definite evidence that they inserted between the acts of legitimate drama interludes and jigs full of Catholic comments on the contemporary situation. All of this provides some lively home-background to the well-organised, vigorous and often heroic community life of poor recusants in York Castle and Kidcote, long publicised in Fr Morris's editions of records preserved by Richard Holtby and John Mush.⁽³⁴⁾

The mentality of occasional conformists (or 'schismatics') was often more complex than we realise. John Mush, speaking from experience but also moralising, describes one, Marmaduke Bowes of Angram Grange, Welbury—'an honest substantial gentleman or yeoman . . . one that liked well of the Catholic religion, as in heart believing it to be the infallible and only true religion of God . . . yet fearing, as infinite do, the extremity of the laws, he chose rather to go to . . . church sometimes'. He later reveals that Bowes had kept a recusant tutor for his children. 'Thus he continued a long time, divided miserably within himself . . . nevertheless in all this time of his schismatical dissembling, he thought it a desperate point of impiety to shut up his hospitality from priests . . .' Thus he was betrayed by the recusant tutor for harbouring a priest, and, refusing full conformity, was condemned, and reconciled to the Church before his martyrdom. But there were other types of mind—like Mrs Margaret Cholmley, a daughter of the Babthorpes and their extraordinary and almost monastic Catholic household at Osgodby in the East Riding. In 1592 she confessed 'she had never been to church in all her life—saving the day of her marriage—neither was she willing to conform'. After a bout of imprisonment she conformed. The Catholic comment was that this had long been feared in her case, and that she took it lightly—unlike her sister, Mrs Dutton, who also lapsed momentarily, but was much stricken in conscience. As we have seen, by 1603, Mrs Cholmley had finally become a Protestant. This streak of lightness or indifference, so deplored by both Catholic priests and Puritan divines in their contemporaries, could also be combined in Church-papists of both sexes with lightness in morals. The heads of the Cholmley family throughout this period were notoriously given to adultery, and their great family quarrel centred on the legitimacy of Roger Cholmley of Brandsby. Mrs Dorothy Scrope of Spennithorne and North Kilvington, a devout Catholic, left her husband, Francis Scrope, the head of his family, early in their married life. The court books note that they could not be reconciled, and that Mrs Scrope refused to divorce him, 'being a recusant'. The clear implication of this, as statute law then stood, was that he was a

man of immoral life—he was never presented as a recusant after that. The High Commission court books of the period also contain efforts to save the marriages of other members of Catholic families—certainly the Cattericks of Stanwick and probably the Lawsons of Brough. In 1598 the Commissioners spent many hours over a case which involved charges of gross immorality amongst Catholic prisoners in York Castle—encouraged by Mrs Redhead, the gaoler's wife. Mrs Redhead's conviction seems eventually to have been quashed or covered over, and we need more evidence before we can make firm conclusions about the guilt of the parties concerned. Yet when all due allowances have been made for both Catholic and Puritan efforts as moralists to improve on such cases in their reporting, and for the genuine dilemmas produced by the acceptance still by both Protestants and Catholics of a pre-Tridentine and pre-Hardwick canon law on betrothal and marriage, it still remains certain that a proportion of Catholic occasional conformists must have been enmeshed in moral difficulties as well as intellectual ones. As for intellectual difficulties, it seems clear from priests' correspondence during the Appellant troubles that the arguments attempting to justify occasional conformity by Catholics under persecution were still current. Holtby and Garnet go so far as to accuse seminary priests of the Opposition of supporting such arguments. Then there was the force on peoples' minds of a still surviving under-current of Catholic tradition. In 1600 Percival Cockrell of Whitby, on being asked by the High Commissioners 'who counselled or advised him when he went to receve the holie communion . . . Easter laste . . . to put the sacramentall bread being receved furthe of his mouth, answered no one. Yet confessed that one Robert Glover now deceased . . . tolde hym that he sawe the devel gnawing of the soules of suche persons as went to the churche, but chieflye of those as receyved the communion, and saith that the remembraunce of the saide Glovers wordes when he receyved the sacramentall breade was the principall cause' why he behaved like that. Oddly enough, Glover's name does not occur in Whitby presentments, while Cockrell, once released from gaol, became a recusant. There was

Ellen Freare of Buttercrambe (apparently never a recusant or non-communicant), a local 'wyse or cunnyng woman', who said she 'sawe all the clargye that were maryed in helle clogged by the fete'. Then there were the cases of continuing 'misliking', with some anticlerical element in it—Thomas Danby, gent., of Leake, who, from about 1582 to 1586 was infrequent at church and at periods a non-communicant. In 1586 the incumbent of Leake accused him before the High Commission as one who 'feareth not god nor favoreth the godlie Religion nowe established'. Danby was said to have taken a furious dislike to the parochial clergy, hounded two curates in succession out of the parish, engaged in a vendetta against the incumbent in several courts, said of the Protestant version of the Bible 'I had rather kepe swyne then rede of this boke', and to have persuaded most of his family not to communicate at the incumbent's hands. The outcome of this case was unexpected—Danby himself conformed without fuss and was not again presented; his family went over to determined recusancy.⁽³⁵⁾

Notes

(1) *CSPD*, cit., p. 17; *ibid.*, 1595-7, p. 368 (Rokeby); *SS*, xvii, p. 60 (Huntingdon).

(2) *Strype, Annals*, 3, i, pp. 470ff.; ii, p. 257; Knox, *Memorials of Cardinal Allen*; *HMC*, Salisbury, v, p. 505; Eng. Coll., Rome, Scritt. xxi, Rawlins MSS.

(3) *CSPD*, 1595-7, p. 368; *HMC*, cit., vii, pp. 492-3; *DNB*; *Complete Peerage*, cit.

(4) *RH*, cit. (Fairfax); H. B. McCall, *The Story of the House of Wandesford*; Reid, op. cit.

(5) *Strype*, op. cit., 3, ii, pp. 463ff. (Sandys). Justices—Cal. Patent Rolls, 1560-3, pp. 436-7; *HMC*, Var. Coll., ii, pp. 94-5; J. Foster, *Visitations of Yorkshire*, pp. 388ff., (1584-5, 1612); *HMC*, cit., p. 99; *YASRS*, iii, pp. 1ff. 1597 election—*ibid.*, xcvi, pp. 122ff. D. M. Meads, *Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*. Scarborough—*STA*, Box 1, General Letters; Box 6, i-vi; *VCHNR*.

(6) Strype, cit., iv. pp. 305-6; *HMC*, Salisbury, xi, pp. 39ff.; *Cholmley Memoirs*, cit.

(7) Meads, cit.; *PRO*, Star Chamber, 8/12/11; 104/15; 110/23; 175/4; *NRRO*, Minutes and Orders Bks., *passim*; *CRS*, liii, pp. 307ff. (fines); *STA*, Box 1, A/i, Comm. Council order, May 1625.

(8) Hatfield House, Cecil Papers, 39/110; *CRS*, lvi, pp. ixff.

(9) Danby—J. Fisher, cit., pp. 103ff.; *BI*, R. VI. A/4, f.105v. Tankard—Lawson-Tancred, cit.

(10) *PRO*, E.377/1ff. (Sayer); Lawson MSS, Brough Hall (Rokeby); *CRS*, xviii, p. 44; *Metcalf Records*, cit.

(11) Peck, cit., pp. 88ff.; Worsley MSS, Hovingham Hall; *BI*, H.C., 1599-1603, f.191v. (Burghley).

(12) Metcalfes, cit., pp. 273-5; *PRO*, Star Chamber, 8/24/1; M. H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition*, 1558-1642.

(13) *BI*, H.C., 1580-5, f.287v. (Cragill); *APC*, 1580-4, *passim*; *CM*; *YCA*, House Bk., 1580-5, f.82; *CSPD*, Add. 1580-1625, p. 71 (Assizes).

(14) *MT*, iii, p. 139 (Thwing); Cleborne—*PRO*, SP. 12/141/28; McCall, cit., p. 235; *APC*, xiv, pp. 75-6; *HMC*, Salisbury, iv, p. 273. Constable—*ibid.*, iv, pp. 258, 420; v, p. 7; xviii, p. 247; *CSPD*, 1595-7, p. 369.

(15) Tankard—Lawson-Tancred, cit.; *PRO*, Star Chamber, 8/276/26; C. 142/353/64. Willy—*BI*, R.As. 4/34; H.C., 1580-5, f.226v. Young—*PRO*, SP. 12/242, 244.

(16) Meynell MSS (Ampleforth); *BI*, H.C., 1596-9, f.269 (Poole); 1585-91, f.227 (Talbot); R. VI. A/14; H.C., 1596-9, f.54 (Whitby). R. VI. A/11 (Hornby). H.C., 1585-91, f.367 (Ovington).

(17) *CRS*, lvi, cit.

(18) *Journal of Eccles. Hist.*, XIV, i (Aveling, 'Marriages of Catholic Recusants, 1559-1642').

(19) *DD*; *CRS*, 10, 30, 37, 54. Bell—Roman Archives, S.J. Anglia, 30/296; *CRS*, 51/205n.; *CSPD*, 1591-4, pp. 283ff.; *PRO*, SP. 12/248; Strype, cit., iv, pp. 208ff.

(20) Nelsons—*CRS* and Foley, *passim*; *PRO*, SP. 12/270; *CSPD*, 1598-1601, p. 375; *PRO*, SP. 15/32. Palliser—*CM*; *RH*, 6, ii, p. 58; *HMC*, Salisbury, x, pp. 202-5; xiv, pp. 289-90. Thoresby—Clay, Dugdale's *Visitn. of Yks.*; Old Brotherhood MSS, cit., i, f.26; *HMC*, cit., x, p. 185. Johnson—*CRS*, 10/43; 30/74, 88. Nightingale—*ibid.*, 10/12ff., 53/122. Lockwood—*ibid.*, 37/199, 30/4, 14/15.

(21) Lawson-Tancred, cit.; Foley; *CRS*, 37/40; *CSPD*, 1595-7, p. 364, 1598-1601, p. 75.

(22) *PRO*, SP. 12/245 (Harrington); Eng. Coll., Rome, cit. (Rawlins).

(23) *PRO*, SP. 12/175; Metcalfes, cit., pp. 125ff.; South Shields—*HMC*, Salisbury, x, pp. 202ff. *CSPD*, 1598-1601, pp. 188ff.; *HMC*, cit., ix, p. 153.

(24) Upsall—*VCHNR*; *CSPD*, 1591-4, pp. 304-6, 377-8; *HMC*, cit., v, p. 77; vi, p. 278; vii, pp. 105, 230; xviii, p. 247; M. Howard, *Sir John Yorke of Nidderdale*, p. 17. K. Knowle—ibid. Whitby—Rawlins MSS, cit.; Cholmley *Memoirs*, cit.; *HMC*, cit., v, p. 54; *CSPD*, 1591-4, pp. 173, 176, 304-6, 351.

(25) Rawlins, cit.; *HMC*, cit., iv, p. 258; vii, p. 300; *MT*, iii, p. 463; *CRS*, 53/101, 277.

(26) Appellants—*CRS*, 51; Camden Soc., T. G. Law, *The Archbishop Controversy*. Pattenson—*DD*; Pollen, *Acts of the Eng. Martyrs*, pp. 305-6; *CRS*, 5/219; *PRO*, SP. 14/20, 15/32; *HMC*, cit., xviii, p. 138. Parker—*CRS*, 5/213, 51, *passim*; *PRO*, SP. 12/245, 14/20, 15/32. Crayforth—*CSPD*, 1598-1601, pp. 200-1. *RH*, I, iii, pp. 189ff.; ed. Tierney, *Dodd's Church History*, 1840, iii, p. 45n.

(27) *BI*, H.C., and Visitn. Bks., *passim*. Wycliffe—*BI*, Wills, 31/328; *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 1957, XXXV, pp. 48ff.

(28) *BI*, H.C., 1585-91, ff.174ff. (Johnson); *PRO*, SP. 12/263 (Atkinsons).

(29) *BI*, H.C. and Visitn. Bks., *passim*; *PRO*, SP. 12/242 (Mush).

(30) *CSPD*, 1598-1601, pp. 210-11 (resistance).

(31) Cholmley *Memoirs*, cit.; *BI*, Chancery Bk., 1599-1606, ff.96ff. (Bellasis).

(32) *CRS*, 30/80; 10/101.

(33) *CRS*, 56, *passim*.

(34) C. J. Sisson, *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*, 1936, pp. 129ff.; *PRO*, Star Chamber, 8/276/26; M. Howard, op. cit.; *CRS*, 53.

(35) *MT*, iii, p. 365 (Bowes). 'Cholmley—*BI*, H.C., 1599-1603, ff.54ff.; Foley, iii, p. 754; *Memoirs*, cit. Redhead—H.C., 1596-9, ff.214ff. Cockrell—H.C., 1599-1603, ff.67ff. Danby—*BI*, R.As. 17/25.

3

The Recusants of the Early Seventeenth Century, 1604-42

GOVERNMENT POLICY and the machinery of repression both went through a considerable evolution during the decades before the Civil Wars. From 1603 to 1619 Edmund Sheffield, third Lord Sheffield, held the Lord Presidency. His appointment was of especial interest to North Riding Catholics, since he was a landowner in Cleveland and a man with a real, if tenuous, Catholic past. His first marriage had been a Catholic one and, as late as 1598, he was reputed to have Catholic sympathies. But it is far more likely that he had now shed them. His first wife lived until 1618, as a conformist, and all his children by her were brought up Protestants. From his first arrival at Mulgrave he announced his desire to forward the 'service' against recusants and personally led the assault on Grosmont in 1599. One odd detail of his later life may well also be in keeping with a new-found Protestant zeal. In 1624-5 his resident steward at Mulgrave and deputy-admiral of Yorkshire was Francis Gargrave, who had been a Catholic recusant in the West Riding in 1619-23, but who was probably now conformed. Catholics certainly regarded Sheffield as an apostate and noted with absorbed interest that five of his six sons met with violent deaths and all died before their father.

Sheffield proceeded against recusants with vigour throughout most of his Presidency. As we shall see in more detail later, he achieved a considerable amount of success, capturing at least eighteen priests—perhaps a third of those at work in Yorkshire in his time—and securing the conformity of some hundreds of

recusants. But in spite of this, overall numbers of priests and recusants were greater in 1619 than they had been in 1603-4. As he saw himself, there were four main reasons for his failure to contain growing recusancy—Privy Council policy, the problem of officials, the problem of efficiency and the growth of Catholic methods of evasion.

In spite of the wide variety of royal Commissions which he held, Sheffield was far from being his own master. As we have seen, Privy Council policy against Catholics, ever since 1559, had shown a considerable amount of flexibility in practice. The root in principle of this flexibility had always been the consideration that, however much repression of Catholics depended ultimately on the dogmas of the Establishment and Protestant faith, even a Crown with both ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction ought only to exercise that repression as a political measure and not as religious persecution or heresy-hunting. Not all Elizabethan administrators and divines had agreed with this—so, for instance, as we have seen, Huntingdon and Hutton had agreed, while Sir Thomas Gargrave and Sandys had not. The issues were burning ones throughout Europe and affected Catholic opinion and States as much as Protestants. In spite of the division of opinion amongst Anglicans, the official line of the Elizabethan government had remained that which we have just outlined. The issues were still alive in James I's reign, and the King, long before his famous first speech to Parliament, was known to disagree with State religious persecution and one of his first acts was to renew forcefully the standing Elizabethan ban on executions of religious offenders without special permission from the Privy Council. His known views, the divisions of opinion amongst Protestant administrators, the currents of tolerationist thought stirred to life by the Essex affair and the Appellant crisis, the new hopes in a fresh dynasty all combined to make 1603 a confusing year for Catholics and York administrators. In June 1603 the second Lord Burghley had complained bitterly of a great concourse of Catholic gentlewomen (from as far away as Lancashire) to York to meet the Catholic Anne of Denmark on her way to London. By November Catholic petitions for toleration were so numerous that Thomas

Meynell's travel bond for that month contained the clause:
... and if the said Thomas . . . doe not at anie tyme . . .
procure or perswade anie of his Maties subiects to subscribe
or sett their handes to anie petition note or instrument to be
preferred to the Kinges Matie for anie Libertie of Conscience
or revocation of any penall statutes maide against Recusants
... (1)

In 1604, in asking for permission to proceed to the execution of three Catholic laymen condemned for proselytising, Sheffield spoke like his predecessor and like an administrator with little interest in politico-religious theory. He said that a flexible or wavering policy was bound to encourage recusants and defeat any efforts to make repression efficient. That was only the first of a series of similar protests from York to London. In 1604-5 the Main and Bye and Gunpowder Plots only increased the confusion, since London's reactions were double—a ferocious series of additions to the penal laws and proclamations for their exact execution alongside a very mild inquisition into the Yorkshire recusant background of the plotters, more stays of execution of priests and the introduction of a new Oath of Allegiance for Catholics. As we shall see, the new Oath was an administrator's nightmare. By 1612 the Earl of Salisbury was dead and the régime of the Howards at Westminster seemed to presage an official general relaxing of the execution of the penal laws. The York officials felt the ground was being constantly cut from under their feet by numerous grants in favour of recusants or favourable fine compositions made with them. The advent to power of Villiers and the fall of the Howards seemed, for a time, to stiffen government policy, but the replacement of existing officials (including Sheffield in 1619) by Villiers' clients, and the rise of a pro-Spanish foreign policy boded no good for the 'recusant service' at York.

The problem of the choice of officials, acute as it was, could not be solved—least of all by Sheffield, whose influence on the choice seems to have been extremely limited. The composition of the Council of the North in his time must have given Catholics extra reasons for hope. Out of twenty active non-professional

Councillors, no less than nine had close Catholic connections—Sir Thomas Strickland of Thornton Bridge (a complete conformist, with a second wife who was a strong Catholic and most of his children Catholics), Sir Thomas Lascelles of Brakenbrough, Kirkby Wiske (his children mostly recusants and four of his grandsons priests), Sir Thomas Fairfax of Gilling (a vice-President from 1609, his wife a recusant and his sons mostly educated at Catholic schools abroad), Sir Henry Bellasis of Newburgh, Coxwold (a conformist, but his heir received into the Church in 1615)—and five from outside the North Riding with similar backgrounds (Sir Henry Slingsby, Sir John Mallory, Sir Marmaduke Grimston, Sir Thomas Reresby, Sir Philip Constable of Everingham—who became a Catholic while apparently still a Councillor). There was a standing Privy Council order dating from the early 1590's, that major local offices should never be given to those with recusant wives or recusant heirs living at home. This was reinforced by a Statute (*1 Jas. I cap. 5*), and by the provision that, from 1610, all major officials must take the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance on entering office. In 1609 Sheffield, in calling Fairfax to be vice-President, admitted that the Privy Council had had to dispense him from the standing order.⁽²⁾

The North Riding Bench of 1603-19 had a different appearance. No less than sixty-two Justices appeared on it in these years. This great number was not due to a severe bout of chopping and changing (as in the 1580's), since the majority of these men sat for quite long periods. On the contrary the great influx must have been due to Sheffield's desire to have at least this department of local government very free of Catholic influences—and to the shower of honours which came from James I, after the drought of Elizabeth's days. Practically two-thirds of the Justices bore names unknown to the Bench's traditions and to earlier Heralds visiting Yorkshire. They were a heterogeneous collection of 'new men'. Some were landowners of weight residing just outside the Riding (regulations against such appointments were easily evaded, since they depended on a property qualification in the Riding long made absurd by inflation), like Sir Stephen Proctor of Fountains, Sir Timothy Whittingham, Sir Henry Slingsby of

Scriven, Sir Francis Boynton of Barmston, Sir Arthur Dakins of Linton, Sir Edward Yorke of Ripon, Thomas Hebblethwaite of Norton, Malton. Others were recent settlers in the Riding by inheritance or purchase, like Sir Henry Jenkins of Busby (son of a receiver-general at York), Sir Timothy Hutton of Marske, Richmondshire (son of Archbishop Hutton), Sir William Bamburgh (normally resident at Howsham), the two Norcliffes of Nunnington and Gibsons of Welburn, Sir Richard Etherington, Sir Richard Theakston (the courtier and projector), Sir Richard Vaughan, William Robinson (a London merchant who had just bought Rokeby and Brignall), Sir William Sheffield, Matthew Jobson (had just bought West Hauxwell), Sir David Foulis (a Scottish immigrant, cofferer to the Prince of Wales and had bought Ingleby Greenhow of the Eures), Sir Henry Musgrave of Norton Conyers, John Clough of Carlton Miniott, Thirsk. Others were successful officials, like Sir Cuthbert Pepper of Cowton (receiver of the Court of Wards) or farmers and stewards, like Adam Middleham (steward of the courts of Middleham honour), Anthony Besson of Askrigg, Sir Henry Linley (farmer of Middleham Castle), John Theaker (farmer of Crayke manor), or attorneys of little estate, like Sir Henry Tankard of Arden, Robert Hungate of Sandhutton, John Payler. Inevitably also, there was the indefatigable new Custos Rotulorum, Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby of Hackness—on many counts an outsider. But this flooding of the Bench with Protestant ‘new men’ was no complete solution to the problem of manning it when so high a proportion of the gentry was affected by Catholicism. Of the sixty-two Justices at least fourteen had Catholic connections; and these fourteen were, with two exceptions, drawn from the ‘old gentry’ third of the Bench. Ralph Eure, third Lord Eure, and his son and heir, Sir William Eure of Malton, were both Justices. Sir William was active on the Bench from about 1608 to 1615, often in sessions where recusants were roughly handled. Yet he succeeded his father as fourth Lord Eure in April 1617, and was himself presented as a popish recusant at Malton in October 1618. He remained a recusant for the rest of his life. He had an uncle, another Sir William Eure (brother of the third Lord), who had

been M.P. for Scarborough in 1601, a supporter of Essex, and, with his wife, a determined Catholic recusant from 1611. This Sir William, though mostly resident at Bradley in Co. Durham, lived for some years in Sheffield's time at Stokesley. His wife was the only known recusant member of the Bowes family of Streatlam. Of the other twelve North Riding Justices with Catholic connections, Sir Henry Slingsby had a Percy mother, an heir with Catholic inclinations and a Jesuit nephew; the brothers William and Sir Henry Tankard of Arden, had a Jesuit brother and numerous Catholic relations; Sir Conyers Darcy had a recusant father and step-mother and a half-brother who studied at the English College, Rome; Sir Richard Musgrave had—ostensibly to his sorrow—a daughter who contracted an apparently Catholic marriage in his house at Norton Conyers; Robert Hungate had numerous Catholic relations; Sir Thomas Bellasis, as we have seen, was received into the Church in 1615; we have already noted the cases of Sir Henry Bellasis, Sir Thomas Lascelles, Sir Marmaduke Wyvill, Sir Richard Cholmley and Sir Edward Yorke. The presence of these fourteen men on the Bench was a dire necessity. But it would be unwise to imagine that they formed a bloc solid with Catholic influence. Some—like Sir Henry Slingsby and Sir Conyers Darcy—were convinced and strong Protestants, and the presence of Catholics in the families of such men could have complex effects. They would be unwilling to cause the financial ruin of close relations—but many of their Catholic relations were younger sons whom recusancy fining could not directly ruin. On the other hand close Catholic connections could stiffen a man's Protestantism and make him—like Sheffield—anxious to prove his 'freedom of that sect'.⁽³⁾

Another weakness of the composition of the Bench from the government's point of view was the fact that the great majority of the sixty-two Justices (especially if we abstract those who were Councillors and rarely able to attend Sessions) resided in the south-east of the Riding—few lived in Richmondshire or the upper parts of Cleveland, precisely the areas where recusancy was thickest. Yet another weakness was the furious legal battle which raged from 1598 to 1616 between the triumvirate of

Hoby, Whittingham and Proctor on one side, and, on the other, a number of the 'old gentry' pillars of the county Benches, the Eures, Cholmleys, Dawneys, Constables, Yorkes, Mallorys, Inglebys, Hildyards, Hothams, Methams, Mauleverers. There were at least ten Star Chamber cases and others in the Council of the North, the Exchequer and Chancery courts at Westminster. The surviving records of these cases would fill a large book with fascinating detail of gentry life and Quarter Sessions practice.⁽⁴⁾ A superficial glance at the cases would incline a reader to accept the clear claim of the triumvirate that they had uncovered a vast conspiracy; a conspiracy in which the pillars of the Yorkshire 'old gentry', indebted, unprogressive, Catholic in tendency, were involved. The claim was that these men aimed, through support for Essex, for the Gunpowder Plot, through fraudulent use of their power as Justices to protect recusants, at ruining the 'recusant service' in the county, discrediting the officials and 'new men', and even, in alliance with pro-Catholic Privy Counsellors like the Earl of Northampton and Wotton, bringing about a change in the State's religious policy. But a closer inspection of the evidence and the persons concerned shows that this claim was wildly exaggerated and inaccurate. It is true that Catholicism was much more rooted amongst the 'old gentry' than amongst the 'new gentry' and officialdom. It is true that seven out of the eleven 'old gentry' families chiefly attacked by the triumvirate were in economic difficulties. There was, in fact, some actual connection between Catholicism, the 'old gentry' and debt. But the connection was far from being universal and necessary. The same was true of the other supposed party. There was no universal or necessary connection between Puritanism, 'the new gentry' or officials, and economic progressiveness—and, in fact, comparatively little actual connection. Only one of the eleven families attacked was more than merely marginally connected with Catholicism and five were overwhelmingly Protestant—the Constables of Flamborough and Hildyards and Mauleverers were, in fact, only a few degrees less Puritan than the triumvirate. The triumvirate were unique, widely disliked and not notably good managers of their own estates. They simply failed to establish

that the Essex conspiracy had any widespread roots amongst the Yorkshire Catholic gentry. They equally failed to convince Star Chamber judges—by no means favourable to Catholics—that their enemies had really supported the Gunpowder plotters. A government enquiry in Yorkshire in 1605–6 sifted through the known associates and relations of the Yorkshire conspirators—William Wycliffe of Wycliffe (a friend and business associate of Thomas Percy at Alnwick), the Earl of Northumberland's Protestant officers at Topcliffe, an ex-servant of Sir Henry Bellasis, a mariner of Scarborough, Rowland Digby of Aske (a Protestant), the Wards of Ripon. Some relatives of the Wrights and Guy Fawkes—the Harringtons of Mount St John, the Readshaws of Oulston, the Beseleys of Skelton—were known, but not molested. It seems clear that this enquiry was not much 'pulled'; the conspiracy had no widespread roots amongst Yorkshire Catholics. A small amount of loose talk about better times coming for Catholics produced no penalties; it was part and parcel of the excitements caused by James I's accession. Hoby's allegation that his enemies were hand in glove with Northampton and Wotton was proved to be mere wild supposition and cost its author dear. The charges of fraudulent use of Justices' powers to conceal recusants—directed against Sir Richard Cholmley, the Yorkes, Mallorys, Inglebys and almost the entire East Riding Bench in turn—seem to have been another case of a wild inflation of a small truth. Yorke may well have struck names out of local presentments—but have done so partly to spite Proctor, who was trying to edge the Yorkes out of ground disputed between them and to exercise a Petty Sessions jurisdiction over areas which they had long, with some justice and by common consent, monopolised, partly with that discretionary authority in such matters then exercised by even the Exchequer where poor recusants were concerned—and especially copyhold tenants of landlords. Law and contemporary usage regarded it as very unjust to punish recusants at the expense of innocent third parties. The same applies to Hoby's case against Cholmley—especially since Hoby was then fighting to deprive Cholmley of his liberty of Whitby Strand so that Hoby could control all liberty and

Petty Sessional jurisdiction there, on Cholmley's own lands and at the expense of his own tenantry. Hoby's case against the East Riding Justices in 1615 is exceedingly interesting. It seems clear that the Justices had no general intention of shielding recusant gentry. (Cholmley, who gave evidence in the case, observed interestingly that he knew a papist gentleman—Sir William Babthorpe—who had been sadly disillusioned about one of the accused Justices. Legard, the Justice, was Babthorpe's cousin german and neighbour, and yet exactly presented him and his servants for recusancy. Babthorpe had said 'for his sake yt shoulde be a warninge to him never after to be Inwardlye familiar wth a Justice of the peace'.) In fact the East Riding Justices had their own local ways of proceeding. They bitterly resented Hoby's appearance on their Bench with two attendant York officials, and his effort to pour scorn on their methods and take their local ways as proof of a desire to shelter recusants. The most violent Justice against Hoby here was Sir William Constable—a Puritan and later a Regicide.

Again, the triumvirate received a small amount of support from the York officials, but in general the latter regarded their excesses with embarrassment. Even the Earl of Salisbury, Hoby's close relation, laughed heartily at the Eures' imitations of the Hoby family's psaltery, and gave him little help. If officialdom stood aloof from the fray, so did the 'new men'—and the great bulk of solidly Catholic or Church-papist families.

The choice of ecclesiastical officials also had its difficulties. Archbishop Hutton survived until January 1606. It is unfortunate that the High Commission court book for April 1603 to January 1606 has not survived. But we have express statements from both Sheffield and John Ferne, the secretary of the Council of the North, that Hutton's administration was 'quiet and pacific' or 'asleep' during his last years, and both were glad to be rid of him. They pressed for, and secured, the appointment in his place of Toby Mathew, Bishop of Durham. Mathew had much to commend him. He had been at Durham since 1583 and had acted thence as a lieutenant of the Earl of Huntingdon in the 'recusant service'. He had long been well-acquainted with the details of the

Yorkshire—and particularly the Richmondshire—recusant problem, and was a close personal friend of the Wandesford family at Kirklington. His arrival in York therefore gave a remarkable new lease of life to the High Commission. The fact that his favourite son, Sir Toby Mathew, became a Catholic and a priest (and was confined in his palace at Bishopthorpe for a period around 1618) was an embarrassment which most likely only exacerbated the Archbishop's feelings against Catholics. His own theological position emerges conveniently in the form of recantation which he set before Leonard Rowntree, an apostate priest, in October 1613:

. . . I . . . having ignorantlie mistaken the waie of life, committing my selfe instead of it to another waie most dangerous & declining towards hell; . . . I sought salvation amonge them that both popishly practise and teache inordinate affiance in meare creatures / Acceptation wth god of praier made neither in nor by Christe / Salvation without Christe / Felicitie naturall without Christe / damnation from god without sensible paine / Uncertaintie of gods Favoure in the Elect / communication of the same favoure to the reprobate; corporall and personall presence in the Eucharist and yet of weake and frivolous efficacie / withholding of the chalice, the more significant kinde, from Christs people; purgatorie against the reste yt the true Josue was to bring his people unto; Adoration of Images; Efficacie of Sacramentes to the overthrowing of the misterie of gods Election; Legall & Jewish Mundations in ther sacramentalls, but, above all, Another ghospell of Justification contrarie to that which St Paule taught and delivered unto us . . . (5)

Mathew inherited from Hutton, as his chief assistant, John Thornborough, Bishop of Bristol—a doubtful asset. Thornborough was an ecclesiastical careerist on a grand scale. Besides being Dean and prebendary of York and rector of Kirkby Misperton, he had been Bishop of Limerick (1593–1603), was then non-resident Bishop of Bristol (1603–16) and lastly Bishop of Worcester (1616–41). In 1599 he found his position in Limerick untenable and arrived in York to occupy the deanery, armed with

great commendations from Cecil and a place on the High Commission. He was already noted for his zeal against recusants and *expertise* in the service. Hutton had accepted his services with hesitations—not least because Thornborough had divorced his first wife and gone through a form of marriage with a lady who was only doubtfully free and certainly pregnant at the time. There is no doubt that he was a courtier—he wrote two treatises in favour of James I's pet project, the union with Scotland. He was specially licenced to reside away from Bristol, and played a very active part from 1606–16 in the service at York, not only on the High Commission, but (as we shall see) on a special Commission to secure the conviction and fining of new recusants. In this last matter, like his fellows, he received expenses and a commission out of the estates seized. The active High Commissioners then also included Sir William Dalton, the King's attorney in the north. Dalton resided at Hauxwell. His only daughter married into the Grimston family—where Catholicism lurked generation after generation in a covert fashion. He had a grandson who was a Catholic mission priest in the county. One of the senior ecclesiastical judges at York was Sir Henry Swinburne, whose son Tobias became a Catholic and studied at the English College, Rome. John Standeven, a prominent proctor in the ecclesiastical courts, belonged to a York tradesman's family impregnated with Catholicism. There is no evidence that Thornborough's corruptness or the Catholic relations of Dalton, Swinburne and Standeven materially affected their ordinary loyalty to the recusant course. It is nevertheless interesting to see how constantly (from the time of Thomas Morgan, secretary to the High Commission and convert exile faction leader, Edward Fawkes, Thomas Thwing, the Beseleys) ecclesiastical officials themselves were unable to keep clear of Catholic family connections. It is very likely that the ranks of civil officials at York also contained a sprinkling of similar cases. Thus Edward Sherborne, a Catholic, was Clerk of the Peace for the West Riding from 1617, and his son, another Edward, personal assistant to George Calvert of Kiplin, clerk to the Privy Council, was actually put forward by Calvert and Salisbury as their candidate for the job of registrar to Ferne, the

secretary of the Council of the North, in 1612. We have already noted the Catholic antecedents of George Calvert, whose parents were recusants at Bolton on Swale, and who was to declare himself a Catholic by 1624-5. He was responsible for the issue of Privy Council licences to recusants to travel outside the five miles limit, and to their children to go abroad.⁽⁶⁾

The personnel problem affected another class of local officials much concerned with recusancy fines and seizures. The sheriff's job was a thorny one, tending to place him between the mill-stones of the Exchequer accountants and his fellow gentry—from whom he was set apart for only one year, and also tending to leave him much out of pocket and faced with years of troublesome Exchequer enquiries about uncollected rents. In 1607 Thornborough sent to the Privy Council a long memorandum on defects in the fining system. In it he accused 'some' recent sheriffs of Yorkshire of dealing leniently with recusants under seizure. It is remarkable that, of the sheriffs in the years immediately before 1607, Sir Thomas Lascelles (1597), Sir Marmaduke Grimston (1598), Sir Thomas Strickland (1602), Sir Henry Bellasis (1603), Sir Richard Gargrave (1604), all had Catholic connections. After Thornborough's appeal, such men continued to be appointed—Sir Thomas Dawney of Sessay (1610, to Thomas Meynell 'my respected and much esteemed good neighbour'), Sir Henry Slingsby (1611), Sir Michael Wharton of Beverley (1616). But it is very unlikely that these three showed favour to recusants. Meynell's Protestant friends were often no favourers of Catholics. Thus he called even Sir Conyers Darcy 'my beloved Cozen'. Slingsby was a convinced Protestant. Wharton, though Catholic tendencies in his family were pronounced, made an immense sensation during his year of office by proclaiming that contumacious recusants would have their houses pulled down and the full rigour of the law loosed on them. He was summoned before the Privy Council and rebuked, but replied that he had been so tired of mass contumacy by Catholics that he had consulted Judges and was acting on their advice. It is perhaps not surprising that the list of some forty sheriffs' deputies who appeared at North Riding Quarter Sessions in Sheffield's time contains only

two names with Catholic connections—Robert Franke and Edward Saltmarsh. Saltmarsh came of an East Riding family with a recusant past but gone over to Puritanism. He himself, after serving as a captain in the Parliamentary Army, was later to become a Catholic, settle in the North Riding and have two priest sons. After the deputies came a motley collection of recusant revenue Commissioners and free-lance agents. As we shall see, from the 1590's it became more and more customary to supplement the fining service by employing middlemen. The most respectable were an obscure royal Commission containing Sheffield himself and the Bishop of Bristol, licenced to hunt out covert recusants, secure convictions, supervise the choice of commissioners to enquire into, and assess the value of, recusants' seized estates. After this came a wide variety of royal servants, courtiers and creditors to whom the profits of the recusancy of groups of Catholics were 'granted'. Both the main Commission and these subsidiary grantees necessarily employed the services of an increasing body of professional free-lance agents. The prince of these was Richard Heaton, gent., of Wetherby who was in business continuously from 1598 down to 1642. He acted as licenced agent of Commissioners, bought and sold the seized goods of recusants, acted as a statutory informer (on a licence from the King's attorney in the north, Dalton), and even occasionally himself took up leases of recusants' seized lands—for instance of the Tocketts family of Guisborough and the Worsleys of Hovingham. This agency was completely legal and the fining system could never work without such men. Thornborough (who was in the business himself) admitted this, but also pointed out the disadvantages. The sheer multiplicity of commissioners and agents multiplied expenses and the profit of many middlemen. The agents were in need of strict supervision. There is much evidence that fraudulent agents existed. The North Riding Quarter Sessions several times punished unauthorised informers. In 1610, on the petition of some twenty recusant victims of his, Heaton was prosecuted in the Star Chamber by the Attorney-General. Amongst the petitioners were Francis Scrope of Danby (our only evidence that he was a recusant; it is much more likely

that there is a mistake in the pleadings, and that he was complaining of a seizure of his recusant wife's property), George and Mary Spence of Barden, George Fairfax of Dunsley, George Franke, Clare Lockwood of Sowerby. Heaton was charged with seizing the property of innocent third parties and of persons not actually convicted of recusancy. His defence was detailed, and began with an impressive list of his patrons—the Lord Treasurer Fortescue, the Barons of the Exchequer, the main Recusant Revenue Commissioners for Yorkshire, Sheffield, Bristol, Sir John Savile, Sir Richard Williamson, Sir William Gee. It is likely that he won his case. In 1609 Thomas Meynell secured the conviction—and, apparently, a capital sentence—on two freelance agents, Thomas Marr and Richard Braithwaite, who had terrorised North Riding recusants. They used expired genuine commissions from Sheffield to threaten recusants with seizure unless they paid bribes. More interesting than their fate was the fact that they had been successful in extracting bribes from a whole series of recusant gentry—Christopher Conyers of Hutton Bonville, Mrs Holtby of Hovingham, George Tocketts, John Ingleby of Hutton Rudby, James Tankard of Arden.⁽⁷⁾

The third practical difficulty of the York administrators was to make their complex machinery of repression more efficient in its working details and methods. They were urged on to this by a considerable evolution in the code of penal Statutes. Three long Statutes of 1603, 1606 and 1610 introduced four new features and a large number of minor improvements. The first new feature was the Oath of Allegiance of 1606. Discretionary power was given to bishops and any two Justices (one to be of the Quorum) to present it to convicted or indicted recusants, non-communicants or suspect travellers. On refusal, the victim was to be committed until the next Assizes. If he refused it there, a second time, he was to be subject to the penalties of *Praemunire*—loss of all property and imprisonment at pleasure. In 1610 power was extended to single Justices, and all major officials were required to take the Oath. The second new feature was that conformed recusants were required to certify annual Com-

munions under pain of a rising scale of fines. The third dealt firmly with the long-discussed problem of recusant wives of Protestant husbands. Hitherto, since a wife had no legal property of her own, the Judges had insisted that such recusant wives must be imprisoned indefinitely as insolvent Crown debtors—presumably to force their husbands to pay the fines. In practice public opinion seems to have made this decision a dead letter. Now a Statute of 1606 confirmed the decision; after three months recusancy the wife must be gaoled until her husband paid her fine—but a half-rate payment sufficed. Also, at the husband's death the wife lost, by seizure, two-thirds of her jointure and dower and lost all right to a share in her husband's goods. The fourth new feature was a fine of £100 for a Catholic baptism, £100, with loss by the husband of freehold in his wife's lands and by the wife of her dower, for a Catholic marriage, and £20 for a clandestine Catholic burial. The small statutory improvements were legion. The most important established clearly that conformity pardoned all past offences, imposed large fines for sending children abroad to school without licences, now obtainable only from the Privy Council. Searchers were to lose their jobs and shipmasters their ships and tackle, for letting such children get away. Conformist heirs were excused payment of arrears of recusancy fines on the estate. The King might opt at pleasure to seize recusants' estates even if they could pay the fines. No recusant might farm seized lands. From 1606 churchwardens and constables were bound, on pain of a 20s. fine, to present all recusants, their children over nine years of age and servants; on the other hand they were to receive a 40s. reward from the recusant's goods for each new recusant convicted by their efforts. Any Justice might now enforce collection of the shilling fine by warrant—and so enforce distraint for non-payment. Fines of £10 per person per month were imposed on those harbouring recusants. Convicted recusants were now automatically at law in the position of excommunicates; they could not plead in suits (except concerning the unseized third of their estates), be executors or guardians, or have ecclesiastical burial. Heirs who went overseas without licence were to lose for life their rights of

inheritance. Possessors of Catholic books were to be fined £2 per volume.

Almost all of these provisions placed burdens on the Justices of the Peace. The mere multiplication of recusants increased the burden. The North Riding Bench seems to have risen to the occasion remarkably. A good deal of the credit for this must have been Hoby's. He was *Custos Rotulorum* and, in the judgment of a visiting Cheshire Justice in 1634, 'the most understanding, able and industrious Justice of peace in this kingdom'. The visitor marvelled at his grasp of detail and of paper business method. It is to him, no doubt, that was owed the use of separate, indexed books of 'Recusants Indicted', starting in 1611—after the Act of 1610. It must be his work that the constables were sifted and bullied until they were drilled into the regular production of more or less adequate presentments of recusants. In 1613 constables were ordered by the Bench to provide for themselves (at 6d. a copy) the proper questions to be used when compiling presentments. In 1615 results were still so imperfect that some forty were fined the statutory 40s. for bringing no presentments at all—perhaps a strike—and other parishes threatened with a £5 fine unless they produced a constable 'sufficient' to complete presentments. After this there was only need for occasional touches of the lash and the lists of presentments became remarkably full and regular. Only odd, outlying places, like Wycliffe, still got away with scanty and irregular efforts. On the other hand, presentments for Catholic baptisms, weddings and funerals (not infrequent in ecclesiastical presentments) remained remarkably few in Quarter Sessions—perhaps an example of economy, since the ecclesiastical courts could be supposed to deal adequately with these cases. Also presentments for harbouring recusants were very spasmodic—as if the Justices only adverted to the law occasionally and the constables normally ignored it until forced. The Oath of Allegiance was only offered spasmodically. We have records of only eighty North Riding Catholics faced with the Oath—all except four in Quarter Sessions. Only seventeen of them were gentry. Twenty-four refused and were subjected to the penalties of *Praemunire*. Of the fifty-six who took the Oath, at

least seventeen remained recusants thereafter and some thirteen at once conformed completely and finally. Only four of the seventeen gentry refused the Oath. As in the other Ridings, the list of takers included strong Catholics like Thomas Meynell of Kilvington, John Ingleby of Rudby and Robert Thwing of Heworth. It is hard to resist the conclusion that the permissive form of the Statute meant that the State intended to use the Oath as a weapon to be put into use occasionally by pressure from Westminster—probably through the President and Assize Judges. There is little sign that the Bench executed the provision about non-communicant conformists. Some effort was also made to cover the neglected and very recusant corners of the Riding, and occasional special sessions were held for Pickering Lythe, Whitby Strand and Allertonshire liberties. There are signs that schemes for Petty Sessions distributed equally throughout the Riding were worked out—but we know very little of their execution.⁽⁸⁾

The High Commission court in these years presents a similar picture of increased method and ingenuity—the work of Mathew and Thornborough no doubt. The court book of 1607–12 surpasses even that of 1580–5 in orderliness and system. The Court now began regularly to impose sizeable—but practicable—fines for contumacy; there were occasional ‘progresses’ by Commissioners; distractions from the main ‘service’, like Catholic marriages, were shunted over into the Chancery Court regularly; Catholics were bonded to confer with divines now as a matter of course and there are signs that a number of incumbents with special qualifications were made specialists in the job. Imprisonment—usually in the house of a pursuivant (which helped him to make ends meet)—was used more economically and systematically to compel the wavering to take bonds or conform. Only the offensively obstinate were committed to the Castle or Kidcote and then usually released as soon as they were willing to take a bond to confer. The large-scale and rather indiscriminate imprisonments of earlier years were abandoned—perhaps largely because of expense. Similarly fines were now calculated more soberly, with an eye on the real possibilities of collection.

We know very little indeed of the workings of the Council of the North and Assizes at this period. Sheffield certainly employed at least one priest-catcher and his search for priests seems to have been at least as efficient as Huntingdon's. His complaints that the Council had very slender financial resources and that this 'service' was paid for almost entirely out of his own pocket were nothing new. The Assize Judges had their own difficulties. Constables showed a marked unwillingness to attend with full presentments—a doubling of their work. It is likely that the Judges had to be content with this. We get an impression that they stood apart from the local 'recusant course', playing relatively little active part in it, and complaining querulously that the practical administrators sat far too light to the plain letter of the law and its logic. Thus they constantly demanded procedures (full and consistent collection of the shilling fine, consistent imposition of the Oath of Allegiance and imprisonment of poor recusants and 'femmes couvertes') which the administrators largely ignored.⁽⁹⁾

Sheffield's fourth difficulty was evasion by Catholics. The commonest and simplest form of this was contumacy. Thus in the years 1612-8 the High Commission certified to the Exchequer some £8000 worth of fines and forfeited bonds of contumacious Catholics—some 450-500 of them. The sheer numbers involved increased the chances of escape, and the all-prevailing system of compositions, often with middlemen agents, for arrears and fines encouraged contumacy. In many cases it was the only way to avoid conformity—especially in cases of secret Catholic marriages. After contumacy came bribery. It was hard to say where compositions ended and bribery began. It was generally possible for the well-to-do to 'buy themselves out' of prison—especially since gaolers held their jobs for life and ran prisons like businesses. We have already noted Thomas Meynell of Kilvington's curious expression that the vice-President of the Council of the North, Stanhope, 'sold' him to the Hull Blockhouse gaoler. Marr and Braithwaite were accused of selling recusants (whom they had arrested without warrants) to gaolers. After bribery came influence. The two Catholic peers of the

Riding, Lords Eure and Baltimore (Calvert), were freed from molestation by royal letters of protection. Even so, Eure's own influence was not sufficient to prevent the arrest of one of his recusant servants at Malton in his presence in 1621. Anthony Metcalf of Aldborough, the lawyer, was legal adviser and servant to the Duchess of Buckingham and gained letters of protection through her. But influence could be brought to bear in other ways. Sir Henry Spiller, one of the two receivers of recusant revenues in the Exchequer, was a Church-papist with a recusant wife. From Thornborough in 1607 until the Commons of 1626 there were constant complaints of his favour to recusants, omission of the names of some, compounding at lower rates with others (for a consideration), easy acceptance of ludicrously low estimates of incomes of recusants under seizure, granting of farms of seized lands to friends of the recusant owners. Spiller was not unseated by this, and answered his critics strongly. The burden of his defence was administrative realities. At all times—and especially in an age of inflation—it was quite uneconomic to press the fining of poor recusants. Expenses to middlemen were so great that direct Crown composition with recusants was the only way to cut out middlemen and impose the heaviest possible fines on recusants. His arguments were sound, but it does not seem that they excused him entirely. After influence came the use of trusts, dowers and debts to reduce the extent of an estate liable to seizure. Here the Crown's practice of always seizing estates of any value (rather than accepting the ordinary fine) played into the able recusant's hands. Thomas Meynell's case illustrates how very successfully a recusant could use these methods—he got away with them from 1596 to 1627. Only a very detailed survey of the seizures can establish the actual weight of the fining system at this period. But we suspect that by 1619 the great majority of better-off real recusants had undergone seizures, that the Crown's profits were relatively small and most estates much underrated, and that the financial burden on the recusants was uneven but heavy for all. There are a few cases of total escape—like Sir Thomas Fairfax of Gilling's determinedly recusant first wife, who (doubtless because of her husband's

influence as vice-President) only appears once in the Recusant Rolls (1612-3) and then was passed over. But even where (as in the case of Thomas Meynell) the seized part was ludicrously small, or (as in the case of Thomas Tankard of Brampton) the husband evaded conviction and only the wife was regularly fined, the total burden included many other expenses beyond the seizure. It included many fees to agents, deputies, pursuivants, the compounding for fines of the High Commission or forfeited bonds, compounding for seized goods and arrears of recusancy fines. For poor managers of their estates like the Cattericks and Lascelles families, this constant pounding steadily brought nearer the day when they would have to sell out. But for good managers like Thomas Meynell and Thomas Middleton of Stockeld (whom he—and the York authorities—regarded as a business tycoon to whom the pressures of recusancy fining were a necessary stimulus to violent improvement of his estates) the burden was no obstacle to a steady improvement of their fortunes.⁽¹⁰⁾

In 1619 the Villiers revolution replaced Sheffield with Emmanuel Scrope, Lord Scrope of Bolton (and later Earl of Sunderland). He remained President until the next court revolution after Buckingham's death, in 1628. As a very large land-owner in Richmondshire and steward of the Crown Honours of Richmond and Middleham (now being steadily weakened by sales of land) he seemed a natural 'pillar' of unity for the quarrelsome gentry and a badly-needed help for the recusant service in an area where it had hitherto been weakest. Yet his years of office saw a very remarkable slowing down of the machine of repression. The main reason for this was deliberate Crown policy. Negotiations for a Catholic royal marriage were intense throughout 1623-5. In September 1623 the Judges were instructed to deal leniently with recusants and a public promise was issued that the penal laws would be suspended within five years. However, the Spanish negotiations finally collapsed by October. In April 1624 James I promised the Commons that he would make no real concessions to Catholics. By December the marriage treaty with France had been signed, and, in virtue of its secret clauses, the King ordered at once the release of all imprisoned for

recusancy, the annulment of seizures made during the last year and return of recusancy fine money paid during the last four years, and the complete suspension of the penal Statutes. The new King, Charles I, confirmed these acts in June 1625. But in August the Privy Council's influence and a storm in Parliament led to a proclamation undoing the suspension and ordering the enforcement of all the penal laws with rigour. This Parliament passed a Statute increasing the penalties for sending children to Catholic schools abroad and added an important clause to a money Bill granting two subsidies. Hitherto, resident aliens who were wealthy enough to be 'subsidy men' had been charged double and poorer aliens subjected to a small poll tax. Now convicted recusants were to be treated the same way and non-communicants were subjected to the poll-tax also. However, Crown policy did not quite return to its old state. Royal protections were granted to recusants rather more freely than hitherto, captured priests were always stayed from execution and soon banished or freed, and a new Recusancy Commission issued in 1626-7. This Commission at one and the same time ingeniously granted some toleration without suspending the penal laws openly and accepted explicitly a number of administrative devices and methods which had long been growing up in the recusant service. Like the previous 'main Commission' of Sheffield and Thornborough, its first duty was to watch over the fining system, secure the conviction of concealed recusants, choose Commissioners of inquest on newly seized estates and keep a watch for additions to recusants' incomes and fraudulent practices. It also received power—possibly like its predecessor—to compound with recusants for arrears of all fines and for their seized goods. What was new was express permission (though not an order) to lease the seized parts back to the owners themselves (which is what, in effect, previous administrators had been tending towards) on 41-year leases which incorporated a royal dispensation from all penalties and proceedings for their recusancy. The Commissioners were expected to extract thereby higher sums from recusants, offering in return protection from the host of informers, middlemen, pursuivants, processes. As we shall

see, the precise extent of the protection offered was never made clear—not least because the Judges were reluctant to take cognisance of a prerogative act which weakened the law. But the protection certainly did not cover harbouring of recusants or priests, sending children abroad, possessing Catholic objects. Sunderland was the main figure-head of the new Commission, but its effective leader from the start was Sir John Savile, another client of Buckingham and a Councillor of the North. By 1628 he had certainly induced a large number of recusants already under seizure to transfer to the new system, and some Church-papists to undergo conviction. In that year the Commission was renewed and, to make the bargain seem still more attractive, the Crown explicitly said that it would be content to seize only one third of estates, to forgo seizure of goods and the separate fining of recusant wives of husbands under seizure on their own account. It was later complained that Savile dealt far too lightly with his clients—for instance Thomas Meynell (who had hitherto paid only £10 a year) was rated at £40 a year on an estate really worth, in all, £500 a year gross; Marmaduke Cholmley of Brandsby now paid £25 a year on an estate worth at least £800–£900 a year gross; John Sayer of Worsall, now passing over from payment of the ordinary fine (£260 a year) to seizure for the first time, paid £210 a year. Nevertheless the Crown's share of the revenue was increased—perhaps not least because Savile himself was appointed receiver of recusant fines in Yorkshire in place of the sheriff. Thus whatever the ups and downs in appearance, Crown policy during Scrope's Presidency consistently worked towards a substantial slowing down of the machine of repression.

It has been suggested that there were two other, lesser causes of the slowing down—the character of Scrope and the dotage of Archbishop Mathew. A Puritan incumbent prosecuted by them said succinctly 'the President is a fool and the Archbishop in his dotage'. Scrope was attacked in the Commons in 1626 as very ill-affected in religion, an opinion echoed by Rushworth. But otherwise there seems to be no positive evidence of Catholic tendencies in him. The detailed evidence adduced in the Commons was very slight and equally attributable to obedience to

royal policy—after all, Scrope's appointment was a very political one. We know very little of Scrope's own 'recusant course'. In 1623 there were certainly priests in York Castle, since two of them were sent to Northallerton in that year to a public disputation with John Bramhall, rector of South Kilvington. The Council of the North received a new commission in 1619. Four new councillors were added, three of them choices of Scrope's. None of them were other than solidly Protestant—not even Sir Thomas Metham, Scrope's choice, who, though his eventual heirs were Catholics, was himself a definite Protestant. Sir George Calvert expressed a wish to join the Council, but was not appointed. Appointments to the North Riding Bench in these years were relatively few—a dozen—and only two of them were suspect. One was a William Blakiston whose identity is a mystery. If he was of Gibside and Ripon—which is only a hypothesis—he may have been a Church-papist and a protégé of Calvert. The other, Roger Wyvill of Osgodby, Cayton, a very active Justice, was declared to be a schismatic by his son when he entered a Catholic college abroad in 1632. Our only light on Scrope's relations with the Bench are the facts that it once fined him for not paying 'lays', and that he quarrelled with Hoby so violently that the King ordered the latter to be rebuked in 1620. In fact Hoby did not sit on the Bench between 1622 and 1631. Nevertheless the Bench, even without him, steadily pursued its normal recusant course. This was true even during the years 1623–5, and it then actually began to impose far more regular fines for harbouring recusant servants. If it received any instructions to go easy on recusants it did not enter them in the record book; whereas it did enter an instruction of the Assize Judges in August 1624 (the moment when the normal course was resumed officially) to secure full presentments and convictions, and in 1625 it entered in full a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, requiring full statistics of recusants. The sheriffs of these years were unusually Protestant—the only ones even faintly suspect were Sir Richard Cholmley (1624) and Sir Thomas Fairfax of Gilling (1627). All of this evidence fits in with the fact that the Judges decided in 1623–5 that, if suspension of penal laws were

to come, it would be better to maintain the normal course and then stay the fines at the Exchequer—otherwise Catholics, already showing signs of uppishness, would get quite out of hand.⁽¹¹⁾

Archbishop Mathew died in March 1628. His Archiepiscopal Visitation Books for 1619, 1623 and 1627 betray no lack of grip. Presentments were mostly full, especially in 1623. Attendances were very small—as usual; but, as we have seen, the presentments were regarded as the most valuable function of the court and supplied the High Commission with its material. The High Commission records show that recusant business went on steadily, though not quite so intensively as before 1619, from 1619 to November 1622. Between 12 November 1622 and 20 July (Assize Week) 1624 very little business was done and no recusancy cases whatever dealt with. That period coincides with the time of ‘suspension’ in royal policy. However the complete cessation of proceedings against recusants is astonishing and contrasts sharply with Quarter Sessions practice during the same months. From 20 July 1624 to April 1625 the Commission functioned normally against recusants. From April 1625 to the following October only three sessions were held and extremely little done—but the reason is given plainly; the Commission had expired at the death of James I and the Privy Council was in no haste to renew it. Thenceforward, until the Archbishop died, the Commission was only very slightly less active against recusants than it had been in the days of Thornborough. In January 1627 Mary, wife of George Metcalfe of Firby, was the first recusant to plead the dispensation granted by the new Recusancy Commission (actually granted by the Southern Commission, which had started in 1626). The Commissioners dismissed the case, but rather hesitantly. In 1627–8 two more similar cases and pleas were received. But now, in both cases, the Commissioners insisted on the recusants taking bonds to confer with divines. There is thus no real evidence that Archbishop Mathew’s administration in these years was that of a dotard.

The death of the Duke of Buckingham ended the reign of his supporters, Scrope and Savile. Thomas Wentworth, Viscount

Wentworth (later Earl of Strafford), became Lord President, head of a new Recusancy Commission and Yorkshire receiver of recusant revenues, in 1628. He had numbers of close Catholic connections. His aunt, Mrs Elizabeth Danby of Thorpe Perrow (who lived until 1629), was a most determined Catholic recusant. Of her sons, Wentworth's first cousins, Christopher Danby of Masham was a constant recusant and Richard Danby of South Cave had died in York Castle for his faith. Sir Francis Trappes Byrmand, Wentworth's uncle, was a recusant at Harrogate. A cousin, Michael Wentworth of Woolley, was also a recusant. Of Wentworth's closest friends, Sir Peter Middleton and Sir Marmaduke Wyvill had recusant wives, and the first Viscount Fairfax of Gilling had a recusant heir. If we add to this Wentworth's consciousness that he worked for a King who had a recusant wife, and with ministers like Cottington, Weston and Windebank who were Church-papists, we can appreciate his strong sense that Catholicism was a creeping cancer threatening the body politic. He was a practical man of business, a gifted administrator, naturally impatient with theorists—legal (whom he called 'mootmasters') or theological ('. . . a generation of folke there are in the worlde yt have such a Stinge in their Tayle, an itch in their Ears, a pride in their hart, as will not give them rest in any condition. Our Saviour would not be helde Holye enough for their Company were he on earth again . . .'). Catholicism was not only wrong because Protestantism was obviously right, but because it was a 'Sect', a dissident minority and so a danger to the 'publique'. He rejected its doctrines strongly, regarded it as a creeping menace to be kept down sharply, but thought it quite possible to coexist peacefully with the unfactious Catholics and even ally with them against other enemies. As an administrator and, most likely, as a man, he regarded bloody persecution as self-defeating and uncivilised. (He was the man who explained that it was only civil to invite compounding recusant gentry to dine after fixing their compositions.) There seems to be no evidence as to what he thought of the particular administrative weapons of the recusant service he used. He did not invent them, but inherited them from his predecessor. He pretty certainly

thought the King's general policy too hesitant and tolerant.

He and his circle certainly made use of one weapon against recusants which we have hardly yet mentioned—wardships. It is curious that there seems to be no evidence that this royal right, so closely watched and accurately exacted by the Court of Wards and Liveries, was ever used systematically as a way of protestantising recusant families. The first Lord Burghley was Master of the Court. Perhaps the first statutory hint of such use of wardships—the law of 1606 that no convicted recusant might be granted a ward of the Court—was no more than, as so often, a legal basis given to an existing administrative standing order. Yet in fact Catholic heirs in wardship of the Crown were commonly granted to relatives who were not convicted recusants, and, as we have already seen, Mrs Elizabeth Danby was actually allowed to sublet her son Christopher's wardship from the Cecil grantees. No doubt gentry public opinion—hostile to the Court of Wards—would never stand for a policy of systematic taking of wards away from their next of kin. In Huntingdon's later years the York High Commission (witness the case of George Calvert—now Lord Baltimore—in 1592) had very briefly experimented with taking children away from recusant parents to send them to Protestant schools. The rapid withering of this promising experiment—like the effort to force Catholic prisoners to hear sermons—was certainly due to public protest. Wentworth was no doubt interested in the matter because of the Danby case, so close to his family. In 1636 the Protestant first Viscount Fairfax of Gilling died. The second Viscount, his eldest son, was a Catholic. The father, by his will, required Wentworth to see that his eldest grandson was brought up a Protestant. Hence in 1637 Wentworth urged the second Viscount Fairfax to hand over his son. Fairfax refused, and Wentworth brought the case before the Privy Council which ordered Fairfax to obey the will. He returned a long and dignified protest, appealing to the Common Law right of a father to dispose of his son, and the natural law rights of a mother. Although the Privy Council returned a peremptory order to obey, Fairfax stood his ground and the case fell into abeyance. Wentworth's own justification, typically, was that the



Thomas Crathorne (d. 1764) of Crathorne and Ness Hall, and his wife Isabel. (Francis Cotes, dated 1767.
With acknowledgements to the Henry Huntington Library, California, U.S.A.)



Newburgh Priory. (With acknowledgements to Capt. V. M. Wombwell.)



Franciscan Friary, Osmotherley (established c. 1665). The chapel—still a Mass centre—is on the top floor.

family would be 'as it were lost to the publique' if the boy were allowed to grow up as a Catholic. The first Viscount Fairfax himself seems to have undertaken the wardship of two Catholic Radcliffes in Co. Durham, at the request of Bishop Morton—though this had no effect on the boys' religion. In 1635 Morton had tried to get Fairfax also to undertake the wardship of the daughters and heiresses of the Catholic William Conyers of Sockburne, to bring them up as Protestants. We do not know who undertook this charge, but it failed of its purpose also. Wentworth's lieutenant, Christopher Wandesford of Kirklington, was heavily involved in this same business. His own sister, through living with a Catholic relation, Lady Yorke, became a Catholic. Wandesford fetched her home and personally supervised her reconversion to Protestantism. In 1624 Christopher Danby of Masham died comparatively young and a second wardship fell on the family. Old Mrs Elizabeth Danby had succeeded in 1594–5 in buying Christopher's own wardship. Now, in her old age, she was faced with the same problem again. According to Wandesford, Wentworth stepped in and persuaded the old lady to let him influence the Master of Wards to grant her grandson, Thomas Danby, to Wandesford himself. As a result, Thomas Danby was brought up at Kirklington as a Protestant and married to Wandesford's daughter.⁽¹²⁾

Apart from these personal efforts, Wentworth concentrated on the Recusancy Commission. Indeed he attempted to make all the various parts of the machine of repression do nothing but subserve the interests of the Commission. In his time there seems to be no raiding of houses and pursuit of priests by the Council. In the brief period of suspension of the penal laws in 1623–4, the Quarter Sessions presentments for Masham frankly mentioned the seminary priest residing there unmolested. In 1637 Francis Lockwood died at Stanwick and the authorities spoke of his presence there as if he had been openly resident and unmolested. Wentworth openly sought to get the High Commission and ecclesiastical courts confined simply to proceeding against recusants who had not compounded with the Recusancy Commission and promising to dismiss them when they compounded.

He ran into difficulties with the High Commission. As he himself admitted, the royal dispensations to compounders only covered proceedings for recusancy. Hence he had no power to compel the ecclesiastical courts to confine proceedings for Catholic baptisms, weddings and burials (or even attacks on the Church of England) to non-compounders—he could only try to persuade the Archbishops and Bishops of the Northern Province (which his Recusancy Commission covered) to a gentleman's agreement with him, which he called 'Christian Wisdome'. Archbishop Harsnett (1629–31) seems to have proved amenable. Little business was done by the York High Commission in his time, and in July 1629 he even released a priest taken by his pursuivant and the Catholic harbourer after making them take vague bonds to reappear on warning—which was never given. Archbishop Neile, his successor, appeared likely to be even more cooperative. Wentworth had perhaps already found the Bishops of Durham, Chester and Carlisle disinclined to cooperate. Either for this reason or for general administrative convenience, the York High Commission from September 1632 exercised direct jurisdiction over the entire Northern Province. Neile began to deal with orderly batches of well-to-do Catholics from every part of the north. It seems evident that these were picked in advance by the Recusancy Commissioners as persons who had not yet compounded with them. They were offered a choice of conforming or certifying that they had compounded with Wentworth. If they refused both alternatives they were committed to the persuivant's custody and made to take bonds to confer. In 1633 Wentworth—for no reason very apparent from the High Commission records—seems to have become convinced that Neile was becoming tired of his very subordinate role and ceasing to urge recusants to compound. It is likely that this personal difference was ironed out. For the rest of this period the High Commission worked in very low gear. The great majority of Catholics with property had been gathered into Wentworth's net and there were few prospective compounders left. By 1639 Roger Blanchard, the Commission's chief persuivant, was becoming desperate. Neile had found occupation for himself in hunting Puritans. But such cases were

relatively few and Blanchard must have found himself deprived of much of his normal income. He resorted to using his standing 'warrant dormant' to carry out searches (in 1631 he caught a priest) and to arrest numbers of recusants and then free them after extracting fees. For this he lost his job. The York Chancery court continued throughout these years to deal, rather spasmodically, with Catholic marriages and burials. Non-compounding Catholics—now small fry—were not pursued. Compounders received astonishingly lenient treatment, entirely in the spirit of Wentworth's 'Christian Wisdome' but hardly according to the letter of the law. Where such Catholics produced evidence that they had been (clandestinely) married before a (Catholic) minister (unnamed) and witnesses, they were immediately absolved and dismissed, with no penalty except legal expenses. In one case the name of the Catholic priest was actually mentioned in court and the judge formally recognised him as a lawful minister. Even so Wentworth disliked these proceedings as liable to give the parties the impression that he was not fully honouring his contract to protect them from molestation. He was more vocal in 1633-4 about Bishop Morton of Durham who proceeded more vigorously against Catholic baptisms and marriages and tried to enforce the collection of the shilling fine. Archbishop Neile carried out ordinary visitations in 1633, 1637 and 1640 in the usual way, obtaining very full presentments but, also as usual, doing very little business indeed against Catholics beyond registering the presentments and passing on marriage cases to the Chancery court. The Archdeacon of Cleveland's visitations at this period survive and are equally full. He also did little court business against Catholics—but slightly more than the Archbishop.

Wentworth was similarly anxious to use the Quarter Sessions recusant service and make it strictly subsidiary to compounding. In 1629 he seems to have secured the raising of the royal suspension on Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby's work as Justice and Custos Rotulorum. Hoby returned to the Bench with tempered enthusiasm. Wentworth was simply interested in getting from him and the Bench the fullest possible presentments of concealed

recusants and the speediest possible conviction of them. According to the Commission, compositions could only be made with recusants already convicted. But where a very covert unconvicted recusant was brought to book before the Commission and persuaded to compound it, it was highly desirable that there should be no long delay in clinching the matter. In some cases Wentworth was able to employ free-lance agents to secure a quick conviction at the Middlesex Quarter Sessions during a visit of the recusant to London. Otherwise Wentworth's service was at the mercy of the slow and measured course of the North Riding Bench with its normal year's gap between proclamation and conviction. This eventually drove the impatient President into ordering numbers of compositions to be made and sealed long before the processes of conviction for recusancy had been completed—a manner of action which was regarded with much trepidation by the other Commissioners and which later, as we shall see, provided the Long Parliament with a small extra charge against Wentworth and some recusants with a legal means to overthrow his contract with them.⁽¹³⁾

The North Riding Bench, by this period, had definitely returned to its pre-1603 dimensions and composition. Only a dozen new Justices were appointed, as replacements for those dead, and all were of Riding families of respectable antiquity, except one rank outsider, Sir William Strickland of Boynton in the East Riding. The new intake included Christopher Piercehay of Ryton, Kirkby Misperton, a conformist who had allowed his son to be educated in a Catholic college abroad, George Metcalfe of Northallerton (a Protestant with many relations on the fringe of Catholic gentry), Charles Tankard of Whixley (a Protestant with numbers of Catholic relations), Sir Thomas Danby of Masham (as we have seen, a 'brand saved from the burning' by the Wandesfords) and Henry Bellasis of Newburgh (eldest son of the very equivocal Thomas Bellasis, first Lord Fauconberg). Added to this, Thomas, first Viscount Fairfax of Gilling, the *doyen* of the Bench until his death in 1636, now had a determinedly Catholic eldest son and heir. The Clerk of the Peace from 1628 to 1632, Ralph Yoward of Westerdale, was a Protestant whose

family seems to have got Catholicism out of its system by the early years of James I's reign. His successor (who seems to have had difficulty in ousting Yoward and only got in finally in 1634) was James Moore of Angram Grange, Coxwold, an attorney of Clifford's Inn. As we shall see, he was the founder of a dynasty which monopolised (except for the Interregnum years 1645-60) the Clerkship from 1634 to 1689. The family's origins are a mystery. Their coat of arms was that of the famous Mores of Barnborough in the West Riding, the family of St Thomas More, with slight differences. James's eldest son, Thomas Moore, was to become a Catholic by the 1650's and found an important Catholic landowning family in the Riding. But in the 1630's there was still no sign of these leanings in the family. James was an executor of Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby's will in 1640 and was very possibly family attorney to the first Lord Fauconberg.⁽¹⁴⁾

Early in the 1630's a number of North Riding Justices revolted against the autocratic ways of Wentworth. He was always conscious that two sections of the community, the 'moot-masters' (lawyers) and Puritans, detested him, and was probably alarmed because the rebels came from yet a third area of society. The leaders were the Bellasises, father (the first Lord Fauconberg of Newburgh) and son (Henry Bellasis), Sir David Foulis of Ingleby Greenhow, Sir Thomas Layton of Sexhow (son-in-law of the first Viscount Fairfax of Gilling), Sir Conyers Darcy. The Bellasises then had the reputation of heading a faction which included Catholic gentry. In 1633 Christopher Wandesford, Wentworth's lieutenant, was involved in what almost became a brawl at Malton with Henry Bellasis and his following of some twenty gentry, including Cholmley of Brandsby and Sir Francis Ireland of Crofton—both Catholics and compounders eventually. Wentworth became conscious that the factious amongst the Catholic gentry, resenting his compounding system and its higher rents and his efforts to get Church-papists (like Ireland) convicted, might join wholesale with the rebels and try to stir up a Catholic strike against the fining system. He was particularly nervous of this possibility. At least two serious efforts were made by projectors to secure Crown commissions cutting across the

field of the Recusancy Commission in Yorkshire. Wentworth had the humiliation of seeing both these commissions granted by the Privy Council. The second, and more serious, one was granted to a Crown creditor and notorious London financier, Sir Arthur Ingram. Ingram in 1612 bought outright the secretaryship of the Council of the North, established himself eventually in a leased prebendal house in the Close at York, and proceeded to buy up Yorkshire property at a prodigious rate. His rival commission to deal with recusant compounders roused Wentworth to a fury—not least because he foresaw that if it were allowed to continue, many recusant gentry would transfer from his system to Ingram's, thereby gaining easier terms, and the pre-1627 rule of jobbery in the recusant service would return. There were also sinister signs that the Ingrams were allying themselves by marriage to the rebels against Wentworth. Sir Thomas Layton had married one daughter of Thomas, Viscount Fairfax of Gilling; another daughter married John Ingram. In the event, Wentworth secured the backing of the Privy Council for his violent measures against the rebels, and somehow checkmated Ingram's rival commission. By 1640 gentry opposition to the government had risen again, this time led in the Riding by two Justices, Sir Hugh Cholmley and Henry Bellasis. They refused to pay Ship-money and were both dismissed from the Bench. But this time there is no sign that a Catholic 'interest' was actively at work with the rebels.

Considering all these evidences of tension between Wentworth and the leading Justices, we might expect that the Bench's recusant service suffered. In fact it steadily conformed in most matters to Wentworth's requirements. Presentments of recusants were strongly maintained and, from 1632, the Bench began to receive them at other times than Michaelmas and speed the convictions. There is no sign whatever of pressure brought to bear on compounders. Prosecutions for harbouring recusant servants once more fell away to very little indeed; the Oath of Allegiance was rarely imposed and then only on recusants voluntarily asking to conform. Prosecutions of poor recusants (for instance, imposition of the shilling fine, and for keeping alehouses) were very few. (This was of extra importance to

Wentworth, since he both included in his compounding net a good many Catholic farmers, and was anxious that the poor recusant tenantry of compounding gentry should not be disturbed.)

Wentworth was also at loggerheads with other officials. As he himself admitted, sheriffs and their deputies lived by fees and the loss of their recusant business to the new Commission led to them being tempted sorely to make the most of their few opportunities to molest recusants. He tried to use his influence to get friendly sheriffs pricked, but was so indifferently successful that he concluded that the rebels, the Puritans and the factious Papists must have a pull at Westminster. It is possible that he now saw little objection to the choice of sheriffs with Catholic wives. In 1629 he had seen no objection to the choice of Sir William Gascoigne of Sedbury as a captain of trained bands in Richmondshire, though his wife was a recusant—as a means of detaching Gascoigne from a possible linking up of rebels and the Catholic-minded. In 1638 he urged that Sir Marmaduke Wyvill should be dispensed from the ban and be made Colonel of trained bands in the North Riding. Sheriffs now had little to do with recusant moneys anyway. In effect, between 1629 and 1642 only three sheriffs with Catholic connections were chosen—Sir Marmaduke Wyvill (1633), Sir Thomas Danby (1637) and Sir Marmaduke Langdale (1639). The last appointment was really a punishment—sheriffs' expenses were heavy and Langdale notoriously careful in money matters and a strong Opposition man. The Assize Judges also incurred Wentworth's wrath. They never ceased to press for the exact enforcement of the Statutes. In 1634 he had Mr Justice Vernon summoned to the Privy Council for rebuke. Yet in 1635 half-a-dozen poor Catholic prisoners in York Castle (apparently there for inability to pay accumulations of the shilling fine, or perhaps for arrears of the higher recusancy fine from before 1629) were summoned to the Assizes by Mr Justice Crawley, offered the Oath of Allegiance and, on their refusal of it, subjected to the penalties of *Praemunire*.

Wentworth's administration of his Recusancy Commission illustrates well the inevitability of what we should nowadays

regard as corruption. The proceeds of the Commission were originally appropriated to paying for warships to convoy colliers from Newcastle to London. Wentworth's patent as receiver therefore entitled him to a monopoly of the handling of the northern recusant revenue and limited the Exchequer to auditing his accounts. This deprived the Exchequer officials of both fees and the 'use' (investing public money for their own profit so long as it remained in their hands) of the money. They could not resist the temptation to exact high fees for 'passing' the leases of recusant compounders and to issue commissions to sheriffs for seizures in payment of arrears of rents. Later the northern recusant revenues were appropriated to other purposes, and Wentworth ordered to remit the money rapidly either to the Exchequer or to the persons to whom payment was appropriated. He protested hotly and in vain against all of this, pointing out frankly that his salary was far too small, and that he was entitled to the normal perquisites of receivers-general—an expense-account and the 'use' of the public money resting in his hands, and now not resting long enough. He had trouble with his deputies. Elmhirst, the chief deputy-receiver, was his personal servant and trustworthy. But he also necessarily had to employ the usual free-lance agents—chiefly the inevitable Heaton—and they turned the tables on him by protesting that his new system, while paying them no living wage, denied them their normal perquisites. Heaton therefore strove to make the best of his position, by trying to get leases of farmed recusant lands (now, obviously, a rare hope) and by acting as the sheriff's agent in seizures for arrears. Wentworth's leases in theory gave complete immunity from later processes for arrears, but Heaton sought for loopholes. Even a Star Chamber case against him, promoted by Wentworth, seems to have failed. On top of all this, a small number of recusants used powerful influences to secure reductions of their rents. Anthony Metcalfe of Aldborough used the Countess and Duchess of Buckingham's mediation successfully. Richard Foster of Stokesley, a servant of the Queen, got his rent very much reduced. Wentworth himself—with some natural embarrassment—got the rents of some of his Catholic relations

lowered, and some of his Commissioners were not backward in pleading the causes of Catholic friends.⁽¹⁵⁾

The political revolution of 1640-2 almost destroyed the whole recusant service in Yorkshire. Oddly enough, the Recusancy Commission survived Strafford's ruin. The King, from 1640, issued a series of proclamations ordering the strict enforcement of the penal laws and priests to leave England at once. On the strength of this, the Exchequer Barons seem to have issued wholesale commissions to sheriffs to seize recusants' lands. It is not yet clear how far this went. In August 1639 a group of northern Catholics complained to the King at the rising of a stiff persecution, and blamed sheriffs, their deputies and agents. Nevertheless Elmhirst seems to have stayed at his post and collected rents under the Commission's leases until May 1642, paying the money to the King at York. The petitioners of August 1639 also said that the northern bishops were persecuting Catholics. But the York records hardly bear this out. The York High Commission held its last session on 28 April 1641 and then passed out of existence. During its last two years it only proceeded against one identifiable Catholic. This was a certain William Fenwick. In October 1639 the Commission was holding him in York Castle, where he remained until at least December 1640, steadily refusing to take the *ex officio* oath to answer questions. It was suspected that he was a priest and Vicar-General to the Bishop of Chalcedon. By December 1640 he seems to have convinced the Commissioners that he was 'William Fenwick of Stanton, Northumberland, gent.', and was released on bond. The Archbishop's last Visitation was held in August-September 1640 and the visitors, so far as we can judge from the only partially surviving record, merely took presentments of recusants. The York Chancery Court held its last session in October 1640. Between 1638 and then it did little recusant business, merely dealing with a few Catholic marriages and one Catholic burial entirely in the easy spirit of Wentworth's day. The Archdeacon of Cleveland held his last Visitation in July 1641, and he also was only concerned to list recusants. The last days of the Council of the North are concealed from us by an apparently total lack of records. We have no idea whether it

took action on the royal proclamations before it passed out of existence in the summer of 1641. We hear of the arrest of only two priests in Yorkshire during the crisis years of 1640-2, and it is highly unlikely that the Council played any part in their capture. The priests were John Lockwood and Edmund Catterick, who were condemned at the spring Assizes in 1642. Catholic tradition on their arrest is circumstantial. According to this, Lockwood was taken in a house in Thornton-le-Street by 'pursuivants' who lived in Thirsk, and conveyed by them directly to the gaoler of York Castle, while Catterick was 'brought' (by persons not mentioned) before a single, and strongly Protestant, Justice in Petty Sessions and by him committed to the Castle. From other circumstances mentioned, it seems that the Thirsk 'pursuivants' must have been either self-appointed informers or zealous Protestants. Both priests were martyred after a short reprieve; the will of the majority of the Commons prevailed over the King's normal policy. Mrs Gatenby, who had harboured Lockwood, may have been gaoled but was clearly not executed. Whatever individual Justices may have done, the North Riding Quarter Sessions appears to have behaved with conspicuous restraint during the crisis. In May and October 1641—no doubt in obedience to orders by proclamation—they procured extra full presentments of recusants. In January 1642 they received the voluntary conformity of Richard Lockwood of Sowerby (brother of the martyr priest) and obeyed a new Statute ordering the seizure of papists' arms. Apart from this their *Minutes & Orders Book* contains no references to action against Catholics. In 1642 there were no presentments; after the Sessions of 15 July the new Custos Rotulorum, Henry Bellasis (who had replaced Hoby after the latter's death in 1640) found it impossible to carry on business in wartime. Apart from one isolated Session in October 1643 (and perhaps Petty Sessions which have passed unrecorded) Quarter Sessions business was in abeyance until 1645.

It would seem therefore that the northern Catholic petition of 1639 was either exaggerated or related to conditions outside Yorkshire. The Yorkshire persecution of 1639-42 seems to have been limited to a wave of new seizures by sheriffs, an outcrop of

amateur informations, and—perhaps worst—the vague and deeply unsettling threat of a Parliamentary bloody persecution to put an end to the extraordinary relative peace which Catholics had enjoyed since 1627. It is interesting that Thomas Meynell, usually so eager to record setbacks, notes none which afflicted his estate in these years.

The life of mission priests and the workings of the North Riding missions between 1603 and 1642 is a subject the exploration of which will carry us across a still much disputed battleground. The fierce controversies of 1594–1603 continued, and new fuel was constantly added to the fire. The Oath of Allegiance of 1606 produced a welter of argument, though the line of division about it by no means coincided neatly with the line between secular priests and regulars. The advent to the mission field after 1603 of increasing numbers of religious other than Jesuits, and a great increase in Jesuit numbers, exacerbated the seculars-regulars quarrel. Rome's efforts to solve the problem of a workable *modus vivendi* between the various interests all proved failures. From 1598 to 1622 there were, in succession, three Archpriests aided by a body of Assistants, with a very limited jurisdiction indeed over secular missionaries and a mandate to work harmoniously with the Jesuits and other religious. In 1623 William Bishop, consecrated Bishop of Chalcedon, began a rule of the English mission which many hoped would prove the opening of a new age of peace and union for Catholics. His advent coincided with James I's 'toleration'. He set up an impressive and unified system of government. There was a Vicar-General for the North of England, under him an Archdeacon for Yorkshire and under the Archdeacon rural deans. He set up an episcopal Chapter. He negotiated an agreement with the Benedictine missionaries and began talks to establish one with the Jesuits. Bishop—whom we have already seen as a former missionary in Cleveland—was a remarkable man and his policy represented the desires of the moderate Appellants, to which party he had belonged. Unfortunately he died suddenly in 1624. In 1626 the Holy See appointed as his successor to his see and authority Richard Smith, who attempted to carry out Bishop's

policy but with much less moderation and tact. The result was a violent renewal of dissension. Smith withdrew to France in 1631 and attempted to rule the mission from there, through the Chapter, until his death in 1655.

The first main feature of the mission at this period was a great increase in the number of religious. In 1593 there had only been fifty Jesuits in the English Province, of whom eight were in England. As we have seen, as late as 1603 there can have been no more than three or four Jesuits in the whole of the north-east. In 1610 there were fifty-three Jesuits on the mission. By 1620 increasing numbers made possible the formation of county 'Colleges' with separate local superiors, and Richard Holtby was transferred from Durham to be the first superior of the Yorkshire College of St Michael, containing eleven other Jesuits; in that year 106 of the 211 Jesuits in the English Province were on the mission. Holtby remained in office in Yorkshire until 1625, by which time his missionaries had sunk to seven. In the years that followed, down to 1642, the Province's numbers mounted to 360-70, its total of missionaries in England fluctuated between 175 and 194, and the Yorkshire College's numbers averaged 9-10. However, these figures do not really represent the full strength of the Society in England. It had, closely associated with it on the mission, an indeterminate number of secular priests, usually alumni of its colleges at Rome and Valladolid, who were ardent friends of the Society, spiritually directed by Jesuits, and sometimes postulants for admission to the Society. Their opponents had already invented names for them—'demi-Jesuits' or 'Ignatians'. Thus in 1618 an anonymous priest (perhaps named Walker) wrote from York Castle to the Jesuits that, of his fellow Catholic prisoners, 'all the preistes reiect me as Jesuited, and how well soever I love Jesuites, I could wishe we had a learned Jesuite in stead of them all, for the good of the common cause . . .'. A list of priests in Lancashire in 1639 marks three as 'demi-Jesuits'. The North Riding contribution to this Jesuit expansion was relatively small—some sixteen or seventeen between 1603 and 1642. Seven of these served on the Yorkshire mission—men like Thomas Foster of

Earswick, John Robinson of Upsall, Richard Busby (apparently of Yarm), John Thompson of the dales, William Tunstall (? of Scargill). An equal number were sent as missionaries to other parts of England. The most distinguished of them was William Wolfe of Scarborough. His father was a poor tradesman, his mother a poor relation of the gentry family of the Laceys, who had produced a priest martyr, but both were at the most schismatics when William was received into the Church while at the University. He later became a distinguished theologian and writer. The rest of the North Riding Jesuits were worthy but undistinguished missionaries, and Holtby's great successors in the Society in Yorkshire, Michael Freeman, George Anne and James Sharpe, were all natives of the other Ridings. Since the onset of the quarrel with the Appellants, the Jesuits had perforce to make their own separate mission organisation. They were constantly accused by their enemies of a kind of exclusivist imperialism, winning over to themselves the wealthiest lay gentry patrons, binding them secretly to themselves through schooling at St Omer and membership of the Sodality, and excluding from wide areas of the mission all other priests than Jesuits and Ignatians. Our information about Jesuit 'residences' is scanty. In 1606 Richard Holtby complained to his superiors 'I cannot get out of debt and benefactors are scant . . .'. In 1632 a long memorandum of Bishop Smith lists gentry households supporting a priest from which seculars had been ousted by regulars. In Yorkshire it appears to note only three where Jesuits were said to have gained control. In 1635 Foley's version of the superior's report on the Yorkshire Jesuits says that 'two or three had very small annual stipends. The rest had no fixed residence, and no other support than casual alms'. From other sources we can discover houses in the North Riding where Jesuits at least resided occasionally and received support. One was Wiggantherpe, the house of Jordan Metham, heir of Sir Thomas Metham. In 1644 his son William Metham arrived from St Omer at the English College, Rome, at the age of seventeen. He reported that he had been baptised and instructed by one of the Society, whom he calls 'Sacerdos Parentis mei', and the Jesuit had sent him to St Omer in about

1640-1. However, Jordan Metham remained a Church-papist non-communicant until 1637 and there is no sign that the house contained a staff of Catholic servants or was the centre of a recusant congregation. It is likely that the Methams gave the priest a stipend and put him up occasionally on his rounds. Upsall Castle was another Jesuit 'residence'. In Smith's list of 1632 it seems to correspond with the house of 'Constable Esq.' taken from the seculars. In 1609 it was certainly still in use by John Mush and other secular priests on their rounds, but must have housed Jesuits soon after that. In 1616 John Robinson of Upsall arrived at Rome from St Omer where he had been since 1609-10. He reported that he had an elder brother at Ghent (a Jesuit house) and a cousin, Robert Robinson, who had passed through St Omer before his time. In 1625 Christopher Sampson of Upsall also arrived at Rome from St Omer. A third Jesuit 'residence' was the house of the Fosters at Earswick. The 1632 report included 'Foster Esq.' as taken from the seculars. Seth Foster arrived thence at Rome in 1609, saying that his parents had been brought from Church-papistry to recusancy by Fr Holtby. Nevertheless Seth said that he himself fell away as a youth and was reconciled by another Jesuit, Fr George Keynes—a clear indication that Earswick was no continuous Jesuit residence. In 1617 his brother Thomas arrived at Rome from St Omer with much the same tale of a Catholic baptism, many Catholic influences in the family, but such intermittent opportunities for Mass, the Sacraments and instruction that 'I did not know whether I was a heretic or a Catholic nor what religion was; when I was away from home I went to Protestant churches; when at home I neither attended Protestant worship nor said the prayers which Catholics are wont to use'. It is very likely that the Foster household was broken up at Earswick by 1613 and that the elder brother of these boys, Richard Foster, established a new family home at Stokesley by 1625-7—which would be the house indicated in the 1632 report. However, Richard Foster was a servant of the Queen and rarely at home in the 1630's. The Thwings' house at Heworth must have been a fourth Jesuit port of call, to judge from the presence of two Thwing boys at

St Omer and Rome and their report that their parents had been reclaimed from Church-papistry by Jesuits in about 1620. We can trace the passage of Jesuits elsewhere—at Egton (Thomas Jenison of Egton sent to St Omer in 1634), Whitby (Andrew Stonehouse of Easbrow to St Omer in 1613), Hovingham (the two Holtbys), Richmond (John Layton of Gatherley Race to St Omer with his brother in about 1604, John Metcalfe to St Omer in about 1639), Leyburn (James Waite, a Jesuit in about 1640), Scargill (two Tunstall Jesuits and the house of widow Tunstall a Jesuit 'residence' in Smith's list of 1632) and probably at Yarm and Lartington, at Overton (John Beseley of Overton at St Omer in 1610) and Masham. In a few cases we can detect the pastoral work of 'Ignatians' also. In 1605 Richard Nightingale of Malton arrived at Rome and reported that he had just been converted by his uncle, a priest alumnus of Rome. In 1635 Robert Meynell of Hawnby arrived at Rome from St Omer and reported that he owed his conversion, in his very mixed family, to a secular priest named (Peter) Hutton, an alumnus of Seville and Valladolid. Occasionally we meet traces of mixed influences, secular and Jesuit, on the same family—for instance the Fairfaxes of Gilling, who sent one son to Douai and one or two to St Omer, but who certainly, at no stage in their Catholic history, came under real Jesuit influences. From all this fragmentary evidence we should conclude that the Jesuits had no great hold over the wealthy of the Riding. None of the families with whom they had most 'residence' was wealthy or influential. There is every reason to believe that Jesuit missionaries throughout this period were almost constantly on the move, with a list of established houses where they could be certain of occasional accommodation and of subscriptions.⁽¹⁶⁾

The English Benedictine Congregation came into existence in 1617. It was formed from students who, from 1588, left the colleges steadily to enter Italian and Spanish reformed monasteries, and who were, after 1603, given faculties by the Holy See to undertake the English mission. There grew up in England therefore two separate bodies, the 'Cassinese' (of the Italian Congregation) and 'Spaniards' (of the Valladolid Congregation) who

engaged in long and arduous negotiations to affect a union and a restored English Congregation. As was typical with the Catholics of the day, there was much argument of a robust kind. From 1617 the situation was that an English Congregation existed, and alongside it, loosely affiliated to it, two smaller groups of Cassinese and Spaniards who had not fully consented to the union. The total numbers of the English Congregation mounted from 131 in 1625 to about 140 in 1633 and then declined to 117 by 1642. In addition to this there were 20 Cassinese and Spaniards in 1625, and still 5 left alive in 1653. In 1625 there were 66 in England (in Yorkshire some 8—6 English, 1 Cassinese and 1 Spaniard), in 1639 75 in England (in Yorkshire again about 8). The missionaries in England were subject to a Provincial (the York Province included the whole north, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire) and immediately to his deputy, a Praepositus, set over each county. As with the Jesuits, there were at least twice as many missionaries in the south as in the north at this period. The first Benedictine to start work in the Riding seems to have been Thomas John Hutton, the son of a York draper, who left Valladolid College in 1598 to enter the monastery of St Martin, Compostella, and was in England by 1605. He was caught and exiled in 1610, but returned to the mission. Sometime before 1614 he was pretty certainly living with the Hodgson family at Grosmont, Egton, and was responsible for the arrival of Richard Hodgson, his host's son, to take the Benedictine habit for the Spanish Congregation at Douai in 1613. Richard told his superiors a story, how Hutton had said Mass in a house near Grosmont, and, on turning to give Communion to the family, the Host appeared to turn blood-red—and that family soon afterwards apostatised. Hutton was quite probably also the cause of the appearance of Lawrence Lowick of Osmotherley as a postulant at the newly-founded English monastery of Dieulouard in Lorraine in 1617. However there is another possibility here. Incomparably the greatest early Benedictine missionary in Yorkshire was Richard Huddleston. He was a Lancashireman who arrived on the mission as a secular priest in 1608. Although his family later had a tradition that he went to Montecassino and

was there professed a Benedictine, it is far more likely that—as was then quite customary—he received the Cassinese habit, did a novitiate and was professed by delegation, all while continuing on the mission. During the rest of his long life—to about 1655—he worked over a wide field. He certainly appeared at North Kilvington, and probably at Hutton Bonville (Augustine Conyers, professed as a Benedictine at Douai in 1638) and Stanwick St John (the Cattericks were Huddleston's relations); he was also active in the West Riding and in Lancashire. Thomas Meynell of Kilvington treasured a piece of Latin verse made by 'my deere freind Mr Richard Huddlestone a religeous gent' at Kilvington in 1621. Apart from Hodgson (who never came on the mission and died at the monastery of Compostella in 1626), Conyers (who was a missionary in the south) and Lowick (a missionary in Gloucestershire at his death in 1633), the Riding knew only five other Benedictines by 1642. The Grange family of East Harlsey—near neighbours to the Meynells of Kilvington and connected to them by marriage—had two, quite independently of Hutton and Huddleston. William Gregory Grange was brought up before his family became Catholic. Returning home from Cambridge, he was converted by Richard Palliser, a Valladolid 'Ignatian', went to Valladolid himself in 1600, and left in 1603 to be professed at the monastery of San Benito in the town. He was sent to Salamanca University to finish his studies and came to the mission in 1607, was soon caught and exiled in 1610. He served as Prior of Dieulouard and then spent the last two years of his life (1617–19) as southern Provincial. It is no doubt clear evidence that the Benedictines had no 'residence' at East Harlsey that George Gregory Grange went to the English College, Douai in 1619, left in 1623 and was professed at St Gregory's, Douai. Some years later he went to the Yorkshire mission and ended his life as chaplain at Kilvington. Robert Paulinus Appleby was also converted by Fr Richard Palliser and left Valladolid college to enter the monastery of Ona in 1603. After a period as Prior of Dieulouard, he came to the northern mission in 1617. Roger Witham of Cliffe, Manfield went straight to the Benedictine school at St Gregory's, Douai, in 1632, was professed there and

returned to the Yorkshire mission by 1636. Francis Crathorne of Hovingham entered the Order by way of Valladolid college in 1620 and seems never to have worked on the Yorkshire mission.⁽¹⁷⁾

It is clear that only four Benedictines worked in the Riding before 1642. Bishop Smith's condemnatory list of 1632 contained only two 'residences' in Yorkshire which he claimed that the monks had taken from secular priests—neither was in the North Riding. As we have seen, it is most unlikely that the monks had any permanent or quasi-permanent residences here between 1603 and 1642, with the possible exception of Cliffe after 1636. Paulinus Appleby must have belonged to the Appleby family of Clove Lodge (and later Lartington) but, even in their very Catholic later days, their own version of their pedigree makes no reference to him, nor had they enduring Benedictine connections. Thomas Meynell's commonplace book gives an impression that, devoted as he was to Richard Huddleston, he was normally served by George Catterick and other secular priests. The Benedictine Northern Province records contain little dating from before the cataclysm of the civil wars, but cast a faint light on finance. The *Constitutions of the Mission* were published in 1661, but clearly draw on earlier practice. Monks were sent to the mission by the President of the Congregation (resident abroad normally). Their monastery was responsible for their upkeep until they were placed in a mission. Thenceforward the Provincial was responsible if they fell ill or were imprisoned. The *Constitutions* are not precise on the manner of placing or on the nature of residences. We only gather that, where patrons exist, placing is a matter for negotiation between the superior and the patrons. The Northern Province *Record Book* contains one deed of 1640. In this a benefactor leaves to trustees a fund to provide for the services of missionaries to Catholics in Wharfedale. We can surmise that the Benedictines gradually established missions or places; still very exceptionally these might be family chaplaincies to single gentry families. Normally they would be either a round of several gentry families and their dependants (maintained by collections or donations, and very liable to changes as families

moved, apostatised or made other arrangements for themselves) or a 'parish round' of farmers and poor Catholics, maintained by a trust fund or collections.

We hear little or nothing of missionaries of other religious Orders in Yorkshire other than Benedictines and Jesuits. An English Franciscan Guardian was established at York in 1632 but no Franciscans seem to have worked in the North Riding before 1642. There was still no English Province of the Dominicans at that date.

It is impossible to produce satisfying statistics of secular missionaries at this period. In 1609 the clergy agent, More, estimated that there were 220 in England who wanted a bishop—perhaps 260–80 in all. At that time, as we have seen, there were some 70–75 regulars. In the early 1630's both Panzani, the Papal nuncio, and the Benedictine, Fr Leander Jones, thought there were about 500 secular missionaries, and the chroniclers of the regulars give, for the same period, some 320–30 (180 Jesuits and 100 Benedictines). That is to say the total number of missionaries had more than doubled in two decades. We can understand therefore why contemporary observers agreed that there were too many priests on the mission. That was the view of Birkhead and John Bennet, seculars, in 1609–10 and—more understandably—in the 1630's of Panzani, Bishop Smith and Leander Jones. The increase is all the more remarkable if we add to the missionaries the professed religious abroad—some 50 Benedictines and 170 Jesuits; thus there was a threefold increase in the number of those ordained or professed. If we turn to the North Riding, we should estimate that between 1603 and 1642 some 65 men must have tried their vocations in colleges or religion. Of these no more than a dozen fell below the gentry in the social scale. Some 46 of them reached ordination and profession—22 seculars, 16 Jesuits and 8 Benedictines. We can compare this with the thirty-five who became priests during the years 1582–1604. It would therefore seem that the Riding was backward in responding to the new impulse of the Counter-Reformation in vocations for men. Was it therefore as true in the Riding as elsewhere that there was a surplus of missionaries

by the 1630's? *A priori* we can think of reasons why it should have been just as true, in spite of the very modest increase in local vocations. For one thing, by the 1630's the very heavy drain on mission manpower by capture, imprisonment and exile had almost dwindled to nothing. The prisons of York were emptied of priests by exile successively in 1603, 1606, 1610 and 1618-9; thereafter there were very few priests caught. In itself, this factor must have added as much as a third to the normal strength of the county mission. Again, in earlier times a remarkable number of North Riding priests never reached the county but were caught on landing in the south, while many missionaries in the Riding were outsiders who seem to have landed on the north-eastern coast haphazardly and, after working a short time in Yorkshire, drifted away to their home areas. By the 1630's we get an impression that the county's missionaries (at any rate seculars) were far more homogeneously local men. This tendency was accentuated by the rise of a group of solidly Catholic gentry families in the Riding which produced a very considerable slice of the secular vocations. Thus the Lascelles family of Brakenburgh, Kirkby Wiske and Sowerby, Thirsk, produced no less than four priests, brothers in one generation. Thomas, ordained in 1624, worked in Yorkshire and was dead by 1638. Richard served for years as a travelling priest tutor to Catholic gentry's sons making their Grand Tour of Europe, wrote for their benefit a best-selling travel book (*The Voyage of Italy*, 1st ed., 1670), was a member of the Old Chapter after 1655 and Archdeacon of Norfolk. John (ordained in 1625) and Ralph (1642) have left no trace, though perhaps one of them became a Benedictine missionary in Lancashire by 1639. The Lockwoods of Sowerby already had two sons on the mission by 1604 and sent several others in vain to Douai thereafter. The Cattericks of Stanwick produced two secular missionaries in the Riding, Edmund the martyr and George. The Greenes of Lanmoth, Leake sent three sons to Douai, of whom two, Henry and Edmund, became secular missionaries. The Holtbys of Hovingham produced a Jesuit in this generation and a secular missionary. The Thwings of Heworth had a still more remarkable record. Before 1603 they had already produced a

priest martyr and a confessor; in this generation they had two priest brothers, Thomas Thwing, a secular missionary in the county, and Robert, a Jesuit missionary in the Midlands, and in 1642 their nephew, another Thomas Thwing, destined to be a priest martyr, was starting his studies. The Crathornes of Hovingham produced a Benedictine and a secular missionary.⁽¹⁸⁾

In 1609 there were some twenty-two to twenty-four secular missionaries in Yorkshire and, at the most two or three regulars. By the 1630's, as we have seen, there were ten to twelve Jesuits and three or four Benedictines. But we now have no lists of seculars beyond the signatures of a dozen who happened to subscribe to various petitions at this time. In Lancashire in 1639 there were thirty seculars and twenty-three regulars; we cannot therefore imagine that there were less than twenty to twenty-five seculars in Yorkshire. Their organisation is obscure. John Mush, after the Appellant crisis and his temporary suspension, served briefly as Archpriest's assistant in charge of the secular mission in Yorkshire. By 1609 it is likely that he had been succeeded by a distinguished priest, Roger Strickland, who was made Archdeacon of Yorkshire by Bishop in 1623, was a member of his (and Richard Smith's) Chapter, and whose origins baffle us. These assistants and Archdeacons can have had little control over their priests beyond acting as their immediate source of faculties. But a York High Commission case of October 1624 casts a precious light on the seculars' organisation. Sir Bertram Bulmer, Kt., of Thirlesden, Co. Durham, and Wilton in Yorkshire was accused of being a Church-papist with a recusant wife, of being 'much employed and conversant in matters and affayres concerning Popish recusants and Popishe Preistes . . . and has been trustee to pay sums to preistes and recusants in England and overseas'. It was alleged that an unnamed gentlewoman some years ago had bequeathed to 'the Socyety of the Saecular Popish Seminary Preistes or some of them or to their uses . . . towards the mayntenaunce of superstitious uses' the sum of several hundred pounds. The money was deposited by a secular priest, Richard Taylor, into the hands of Sir Bertram as trustee. Sir Bertram pays sums out of this to Taylor, 'one Mr Slater, Henry Holden and

George Cathericke' . . . popish priests. This may have been no more than an early example of a mission foundation, but it might indicate that there already existed in action a secular priests' Brotherhood such as Mush had failed to establish in 1598-1602 and as existed from the 1660's. Such a Brotherhood was meant to be a voluntary society with a common fund, designed to support unemployed or sick missionaries, compose controversies in the allotment of residences, and encourage the missionaries to keep a rule of life. Our picture of secular residences or districts is necessarily very hazy at this period. To start with we have the evidence provided (very imperfectly) by the Douai Diaries of gentry families which sent sons as convicts there—the Eures, Fairfaxes, Inglebys, Meynells of Kilvington, Danbys of Leake, Scropes, Bartons of Whenby, Wyvills of Constable Burton, Wyvills of Osgodby, Stricklands of Thornton Bridge and Sizergh, Tankards of Brampton, Metcalfes of Firby, Raysins of Amotherby, Pudseys of Barforth, Yowards of Westerdale, Smithsons of Cowton, Middleton Tyas, Percehays of Ryton, Kirkby Misperton. Besides these, there were the strong Douai families of Lascelles, Lockwood, Greenes, Cattericks. It is extremely likely that all of these families subscribed to secular priest funds and that their houses were used as regular stations for passing secular missionaries. But some of these families also welcomed regulars on occasion—the Meynells of Kilvington, Lord Eure at Malton, most probably the Fairfaxes. Our evidence that any of their houses—or any other places—were used as permanent or semi-permanent residences is very slight. In about 1624 the Tankards of Brampton received a royal pardon for having harboured a priest relative, Basil Norton. Unfortunately it is not clear whether he was caught at Brampton or the family's dower-house in Boroughbridge in the West Riding, nor whether he was really resident with them. The family had the best-documented record of supporting priests for Yorkshire. In 1579 two priests were caught in their Boroughbridge house and in 1582 five priests reported to have said Mass there at various times. In 1601-2 priests had been to Brampton to say Mass and baptise. Finally, in 1638 Thomas Tankard was in trouble because a High

Commission pursuivant had discovered trunks at Brampton which contained popish books and were said to belong to a seminary priest. In 1609 two priests were taken in Richard Cholmley's house at Brandsby. We hear no more of priests there until 1647 when the secular priest, Thomas Thwing, escorted Richard's grandson to school at Douai. In 1606 the Pudsey family housed a priest at Barforth, but soon afterwards the family moved to the West Riding and Barforth became a dower-house. In 1624 a secular priest, Francis Lockwood, was presented by the Stanwick churchwardens as living with—or alongside—the Catterick family. He died in 1637 at Aldborough—possibly with the Metcalfe family there. In 1642 John Lockwood was caught in the house of Mrs Gatenby, a widow of little means living in Thornton-le-Street parish surrounded by several houses of Catholic gentry. Finally there are quite numerous places where secular priests made an impact even if there is no evidence they had a residence there—at Egton and Whitby (whence boys were sent to Douai), at Upsall (until the Jesuits took over after 1609), at Hawnby, at Kirkby Hill (a secular priest named Harrison in 1624), at Masham (in 1639—the Jesuits were there in the 1620's), Middleton Tyas, Richmond (Harrison there also in 1624), Yarm, Westerdale.⁽¹⁹⁾

The great battle of seculars and regulars inevitably had repercussions in the Riding as it developed in complexity and bitterness after the opening rounds in the Appellant crisis. A truce ensued briefly and John Mush was restored to leadership of the main secular priest body in Yorkshire. In 1606 broke out the Oath of Allegiance crisis which, however, proved to be a cross-issue. The great majority of seculars and regulars seem to have come down against the legitimacy of taking the Oath; at a meeting in London with Birkhead, the Archpriest, Holtby and Mush found themselves in uneasy union against it. However it is evident—if only from the North Riding evidence—that a number of the gentry had little scruple about taking the Oath under pressure and that they must have been treated lightly by their confessors. Unfortunately the Oath was presented to so few of the Riding's gentry (seventeen) and even fewer of any consequence or known affiliations with seculars or Jesuits that we are left with

extremely little positive evidence on the attitudes to the Oath of North Riding priests and laity. Thomas Meynell is certainly recorded by the High Commissioners as having taken it, and he had both secular and regular priests to serve him. John Ingleby of Rudby had secular priest connections. Robert Thwing was a younger son and brother of a secular priest martyr, and the rest of his family had not yet come under Jesuit influence. However the polemicists amongst seculars and regulars henceforward did not cease to suggest that the other side was unable to control an unruly minority of priests who taught their penitents that taking the Oath was no sin. Polemics went further and implied that the principles of their enemies inevitably involved this—the Jesuit view of equivocation and the allegedly Gallican views of the seculars. Hence Bishop Smith in 1631 openly charged the regulars as a body with such conduct; while the unknown ‘Ignatian’ in York Castle in 1618 charged his secular priest fellow-prisoners, Thomas Carter and William Johnson with having taken the Oath and being willing even to go to church. By 1623 there began another crisis—over episcopal authority—made violent by Bishop Smith’s extreme demands for control over all regulars. Both sides openly appealed to the gentry; Smith issued a pastoral to them stating his case, and the Jesuits retaliated by getting round-robins signed by their gentry supporters. Of Catholic peers in or connected with the Riding, Lord William Howard (still fighting a legal battle to hold his Dacre lands) and Lord Baltimore of Danby Wiske and London were for the regulars, the Earl of Rutland and Lord Eure said to be for Bishop Smith. As a constant background to these crises there were charges and counter-charges of disorderly lives, and of avarice and unscrupulousness in the struggle for ‘residences’. Bishop Smith’s indictment of the regulars is extremely vigorous. For him the root of what he calls the chaos and decline of Catholicism is threefold—the absence of a complete episcopal control over all Catholics, regulars, seculars, laity; the presence of religious out of their religious houses and on the mission; the fact that the Catholic gentry, free of normal episcopal control, are the masters of the clergy and impose on them their own relaxed standards on

morals, marriage, the Oath, *communicatio in sacris*. He charges the regulars, without exception, with indiscipline, laxity in moral behaviour, sending too many and too untrained men to the missions; it is from them that the laxity of the laity stems. In particular he charges twenty regular missionaries (including four of the Cassinese) with grave moral delinquency. We can compare with this the admissions of two secular priests, Birkhead and John Bennet in 1610, that the colleges—particularly Douai—were sending too many men and too fast to the secular mission, men sometimes totally unfit and usually too ignorant; that too many apostatise or are lax; that their great need is religious discipline, and the laity, not unnaturally, are very critical of the clergy and unwilling to open their houses freely to them. The unknown 'Ignatian' of 1618 bluntly said of the six priests prisoners with him at York (two Benedictines and four secular priests) . . . 'God grant our freindes never prefarre any more such silly unfitt men as they . . . for yt harteth our common cause . . .'. We can compare the judgment of Panzani, an outsider. He insists on the necessity of real episcopal control over all missionaries, says nothing of the laity in detail, beyond the fact that he thinks very many of them support the bishop; notes much laxity amongst priests and laity, but, considering the difficulty of English conditions, is also impressed, especially by the discipline of the Jesuits. To him also, the Benedictines and few members of small Orders were the darkest spot in his picture of the clergy. Nothing in the North Riding records we have seen really casts any positive light on all this. Thomas Meynell of Kilvington has no comments on the clergy in general; his two marriages were performed by 'vertuous' Marian priests—a medieval expression, implying a traditional Catholic distinction between the cloth and the man and a knowledge of the wide varieties of moral and spiritual stature in the clergy; he had Richard Huddleston, the Cassinese Benedictine, as his 'dear friend'. The two 'silly unfitt' Benedictines of 1618 were Robert Hungate and Clement Reyner. The 'Ignatian' charges neither with laxity about the Oath or tendencies to apostasy and has a respect for Hungate's charity to the poor prisoners. As far as

we can tell, Reyner (a native of Ripon) was a scrupulous and hesitant man who had been dismissed by the secular priest college authorities as 'unfit for our institute'—admittedly, after several waverings towards monastic life, and after ordination to the diaconate. He became a monk of Dieulouard in 1608 and was sent to the mission in 1616-7. He was exiled from York Castle in 1618, returned at once to the mission and appears to have been gaoled again. In 1624 he was free and escorted several young women abroad to convents, on his way to be Prior of his monastery. In the last forty years of his long life he served as confessor to the Benedictine nuns at Cambrai, Provincial of York (1649-53), again as Prior and died in Yorkshire. Robert Hungate was a cousin of the North Riding Justice of that name and one of three brothers who became monks. Because they took other names in religion, their careers are hopelessly entangled in the records. But in 1618 Robert was taken from the Castle to a public disputation at Northallerton with the famous John Bramhall, then rector of South Kilvington and later Bishop of Derry. Although Bramhall was confident that he had won this tournament—which seems to have been his idea—his brief account of it hardly implies that Hungate was without the elements of theological learning altogether. Indeed, if, as we are inclined to think, Robert was Fr Augustine Hungate in religion, he had done an extra course of studies at the Marchiennes College, somehow escaped from York, was chaplain to his relative, Lord William Howard, at Naworth in 1632-3—and we can hardly imagine Lord William, with his bookish tastes, relishing a foolish and illiterate chaplain—and later to his other relatives, the Fairfaxes of Gilling. We may also add that Panzani's appeal for unity did lead the Benedictines to make a pact with Bishop Smith in 1633—and that it was they who had come to terms amicably with William Bishop in 1624. They had their oddities, indeed. There was Fr Preston, Fr Leander Jones with his œcumenism (more discerning and tempered with age), Fr David Codner (whom Bishop Smith regarded with horror as a man of disorderly morals, but whom Panzani, a year or two later, regarded with amused respect), Fr Augustine Baker (with his method of converting

souls by teaching Protestants his way of prayer). There were apostates, though they were few. Neither of the two Yorkshire Benedictine apostates of this period was a missionary or came from the North Riding. (They were Dunstan Gibson who vanished from St Edmund's, Paris, after 1636, and Robert Stapleton of Carlton, a junior monk of St Gregory's, Douai, who got leave to go to England for health reasons, refused to return to his monastery, appealed to Rome to get his profession invalidated, failed to get the decision he wanted, apostatised and ended his life as a courtier in 1642, a knight and gentleman-usher to the Prince of Wales). The Jesuits also had their casualties—Smith said he knew of seven apostate missionaries, or at least Jesuit missionaries dismissed from the Society and whose standing was in doubt. Thomas Wright, one of these cases, was an *enfant terrible* indeed, a strong Catholic but also a strong believer in the legitimacy of the Oath and of occasional conformity when under pressure. He ended his life as a member of Bishop's Chapter. The secular priests had their casualties too. One, Rouse (probably Anthony Rouse), seems to have been a prisoner in York Castle, an apostate and agent of the President, and then reconciled to the Church and a penitent in Flanders. Leonard Rountree, a convert clergyman from Cleveland, became a Catholic in 1608, tried his vocation with the Benedictines but left because of ill-health, was ordained as a secular priest and sent to the Yorkshire mission in 1611. After two years mission work he apostatised, but was reconciled and went to Louvain. There he was overcome by doubts and in 1616 returned to York and apostatised again. It is interesting that a letter from an anonymous secular priest missionary to Thomas More in 1611-2 analyses the causes for these troubles of the secular priests. He says that many are 'minus doctrina instructi'; they are incapable of giving spiritual direction to each other and the laity and equally incapable of deciding cases of conscience justly. To the writer, Mass priests who only give Mass, Communion and sacramental absolution to the people are not enough. Ordinary laypeople, particularly under the pressures of persecution, deprived necessarily of instructions and sermons, often incapable of reading

books to any extent, normally only seeing a priest when he comes to visit them once in six months or so, absolutely require spiritual instruction and direction given to each individually. They also need expert solution of their cases of conscience adapted to each individual. The writer adds, interestingly, that in contemporary society, there is, amongst the Protestant laity and especially the better educated, a strong and growing interest in religion, in matters of controversy and in cases of conscience. Such persons come across Catholic books and seek out priests as a matter of curiosity or for controversy—and rarely succeed in finding a priest who can talk to them to their satisfaction. In fact we know that Protestant society then contained many features closely resembling Catholic ones—amongst the many shades of Puritan and Arminian the practice of spiritual direction, casuistry, households turned into little ‘monasteries’, the great influence of pious women, a violent and increasing discontent with the ‘Mass priest’ type of incumbent and curate which the Church of England had inherited from the Middle Ages, together with lay impropriations, nonresidence and pluralism.⁽²⁰⁾

North Riding missionaries of this period were not entirely backward in providing literature for Catholics and Protestants. Richard Lascelles brought out his *A Little Way How to Heare Masse with Profit and Devotion* at Paris in 1644, with a dedication to Lady Ann Brudenell. However he was hardly a typical missionary and the book is addressed to the Catholic aristocracy who either have house chaplains or live abroad. His introduction incorporates an apologetic section for chance Protestant readers. He castigates Catholic ladies who take priests to task for their slowness in saying Mass—‘its a shame to heare women that can hardly read the petitions of the Jesus Psalter undertaking to teache Priests to wipe their chalices, to make their Memento’s and to perform their ceremonies . . .’. He suggests that his readers should use the Rheims New Testament for Epistles and Gospels and as a basis for prayer at Mass ‘with the leave of thy ghostly Father’. His paraphrase of the Canon inserts ‘Richard of Chalcedon our bishop’ with a strong profession of obedience to him. Richard Huddleston, on the other hand, was a very practical missionary of

vast experience. His *A Short and Plain Way to the Faith and Church* circulated in MS and was not printed in his lifetime. Robert Hungate may well have been the editor of *The Mystical Crowne of the most glorious Virgin Marie, translated out of Latin*, published at Douai in 1638.

The years 1603-42 saw a considerable expansion of English convents for women overseas, building on the tiny nucleus of the English Bridgettines (with their unique continuous community life back to the fifteenth century), the Benedictine community of Brussels (founded in 1597) and the English Augustinian Canonesses of Louvain (where Englishwomen had been entering in the 1590's, if not earlier.) By 1642 there were some seventeen completely English convents belonging to eight Orders, as well as an unknown number of English in foreign communities. Their records are not by any means all published, extant or, if extant, complete, so it is impossible to judge the exact number of North Riding women who entered religious life. By 1642 we can trace some fifteen—which seems to be a small number, considering the contribution of other areas with fewer Catholics. There seems to have been a twofold source of these vocations. One was a spontaneous movement in England to seek a 'more retired and recollected life'—a feeling which, as we have seen, overtook Thomas Warcop. The immediate reaction of such people was to intensify their devotions at home, under the guidance of a priest. We have seen Margaret Clitheroe doing this in her York house, the Babthorpes at Osgodby with their daily liturgical round, and it is clear that the Meynell family at North Kilvington and Talbots of Thornton-le-Street had something of the kind on a lesser scale. Even individuals in part-Protestant households could take hours for prayer and spiritual reading and saying of the Little Office of our Lady—witness the examples in the 'birth-briefs' of the new arrivals at the English College, Rome. We can compare the (apparently few) cases of mission priests being postulants to religious Orders and even doing their novitiates and being professed while working on the mission; or the way in which prison life could be treated as an occasion for a long retreat, much prayer and instruction by

priest-prisoners. The Jesuits were early alive to the need to instruct the devout in this sort of retired life. There exists amongst the Stonyhurst Anglia MSS, dated 30 October 1604, 'An instruction and direction for the spiritual helpe of such English gentlewomen as desyre to lead a more retired & recollected life then the ordinarie in England doth yeald'. This suggests that, as was then common in Italy and Spain, informal groups of friends might live together. No religious habits were needed. As for vows, individuals, as the confessor advised might 'some make one vow (e.g. of chastity or obedience), some two, some all three, some perpetually, some for a tyme'. It pointed out that this would arise all the more naturally because of the vows of obedience commonly made to ghostly fathers. It was natural that some should take the step from this informal and individual devout life to entry into religion of the established types. The Brussels Benedictine community thus grew out of devout groups of the ladies amongst the Flanders English exiles, and the leading spirit was Lady Mary Percy, who was perhaps the first North Riding woman to enter one of the new convents. Mary Ward's persistent effort to keep her 'Daughters of St Agnes' free of conventual enclosure and habits must have owed a good deal to this background of 'informal religious life', of which she had a good deal of experience. She was brought up in the house of her grandmother, Mrs Ursula Wright, to a daily round of family prayers and hymns, with individuals encouraged to undertake recital of the Day Hours of the Roman Breviary, the Litany of our Lady and the rosary. At the age of twelve her father moved her to a similar household at Harewell, and then to the Babthorpes' at Osgodby. This peripatetic great household, like that of the few other well-to-do and homogeneously Catholic gentry, contained numbers of young people of related gentry families, was more frequently visited by priests—secular and regular—and in touch with developments in religious life abroad. There Mary read books on the religious life and one (*The Rules of Christian Life*) which must have been typical of such a devout household ('... a way of distributing the days of the week for the exercise of divers virtues and of dedicating the rooms of the

house to various saints . . . to practice the virtue most eminent in the same saint . . .'). She also spent part of her time with the Inglebys of Ripley, a similar household, from which girls left for the convents. She reached Flanders in 1606, tried her vocation with the English Poor Clares, visited the Brussels Benedictines and emerged, bound by private vows of chastity, to serve others and to enter some religion. After a visit to England she returned to St Omer in 1609 with several like-minded companions and by 1616 was the head of a group of no less than sixty young women, bound only by private vows and engaged in running schools for English girls, passing some of them on to convents and returning to England to catechise children. It is very unfortunate that no full lists of the group seem to survive. Not unnaturally, it contained a leaven of Yorkshire girls. We hear of 'Mary Chator' (? of the Croft family, otherwise unknown to be Catholics then or later), of 'Mrs Wyvill' (presumably of the Constable Burton and Masham family), 'Mother Ratcliffe' of Yorkshire (presumably from Ugthorpe). By 1629 the 'Institute' was a large affair with houses scattered widely over Europe and a considerable personnel, including Germans, Austrians and Italians. That year conservative prejudice against her Institute led to its condemnation by Rome and partial dissolution. At that time Mother Wyvill was superioress of the largest surviving group of the English, at Liège. By 1632 the survivors received permission to continue, though their canonical position very long remained hazardous and, in the long run, they were forced to assimilate themselves to conventional Orders in many ways. In 1637 Mary Ward returned to England and led a small community to Newby, Ripon, and then to a hired house at Hutton Rudby in 1642.

The other way in which girls might enter religious life was purely traditional. Thus Christopher Stonehouse, a poor Catholic farmer of Dunsley, Whitby, received priests into his house, and vowed that if he had two daughters, he would give them both to the religious life. At Brough Mrs Lawson's mother, Lady Constable ' . . . seeing Mrs Lawson had so many children, was willing to bestow (e.g. pay the convent dowry for) some one of

them in religion'. The one chosen, because of her disposition that way, was Dorothy Lawson and her father 'who was very devout to St Augustine . . . at his death desired one of his children might enter' the convent of the Augustinian Canonesses at Louvain. We can see the interplay of all of these motives. Thus Mary and Perpetua Best (most likely the children of a Co. Durham Catholic gentry vagrant family often in Yorkshire) were sent young to Flanders in about 1605 'to learn the language'—probably to an exile group of relations there. They entered the convent of Augustinian Canonesses at Bruges as soon as benefactors in England could find the money for their dowries—almost the sole income of the convents. Ann Stonehouse of Dunsley, vowed before birth to religion by her father, was found a servant's place by priests, first at Ripley and then at Osgodby. From the household she caught a spontaneous desire of her own to enter religion, but lacked all means to carry it out. She moved to another Catholic house at Naburn and there obtained a place with Lady Babthorpe in Louvain, whence she entered the convent of the Canonesses as a laysister and got her sister over to join her. We may suspect that the same mixture of factors led to the entry of Elizabeth Thwaites of North Kilvington into the Poor Clares community of Gravelines in 1615. Her mother was a West Riding widow with a large family who remarried into the Meynell family. Thomas Meynell comments in his commonplace book—he was much concerned with arranging the marriages and 'placing' of these in-laws—that she 'consecrated her virginity to pure divinity'. In 1635 an unidentified member of his own family—a poor relation, Mary Meynell—became a laysister at the English Benedictine convent at Ghent. In 1639 a cousin, Mary Talbot of Thornton-le-Street, entered the English Augustinian Canonesses' convent at Paris. The Foster family of Earswick had a Bridgettine uncle, Seth Foster, and at least one girl of the family followed him into his community in these years. But a daughter of Richard Foster of Earswick and Stokesley entered the English Benedictine convent at Ghent and became first abbess of their daughter-house, first at Boulogne and then at Pontoise. During the exile years of the Interregnum, Richard, now a knight and

treasurer to Queen Henrietta Maria at Boulogne, gave considerable financial help to his daughter's convent. Finally there were three other North Riding nuns; two of these were daughters of Lord Eure of Malton who became Benedictine nuns at Cambrai and Brussels. The third, Margaret, daughter of George Franke of Knighton, was very possibly influenced by the Inglebys of Ripley, her relations. She certainly entered the English Franciscan convent at Brussels at much the same time as three Ingleby girls. It was this same convent which launched out in 1639 on an experiment on which we should like to be better informed. Three sisters—one an Ingleby—were apparently sent to England by the Franciscan Provincial 'for the setting up of a Seminary in our native soyle of England of young Gentlewomen for the benefit and help of this convent'.⁽²¹⁾

In 1603 there had been 1,100–1,200 Catholics in the North Riding. By the mid-1620's the number had risen to 1,700 and in 1642 to some 1,800–1,900. In 1603 about 120 gentry families of every sort were affected by Catholicism; 71 of these were drawn from the 200 resident armigerous families. In the mid-1620's the approximate figures were 120 families, of which 66 were armigerous residents; in 1642 they were respectively 109 and 63. Thus throughout these decades the gentry remained very heavily affected by Catholicism—almost a third of the established squirearchy was touched. Yet in the two decades before the civil wars—the period of slackening of persecution in everything except fines—a slight decline set in. Catholic congregations in general continued to increase in numbers and size—in each case the first number is for Catholics in the 1620's, the second for 1642)—Egton (126, 138); Lythe (45, 40); Forcett (60, 81); Thornton-le-Street (44, 64); Brandsby (21, 38); Malton (9, 42); Northallerton (20, 39); Leake (10, 38); Wensley (4, 35); Catterick (15, 31); Manfield (15, 28); Brotton (45, 43); Crathorne (21, 25); Bedale (12, 19); Yarm (2, 13); Hilton (17, 21); Helmsley (10, 28); Hovingham (28, 40); Kirkleavington (22, 23); Aysgarth (16, 19); Appleton Wiske (32, 25); Stokesley (29, 21); Grinton (30, 24). The noteworthy declines were at Masham (108, 62); Whitby Strand (68, 58);

Stanwick St John (70, 61); Kirkby Ravensworth (59, 43); Middleton Tyas (40, 16).

Gilling West retained its primacy in Richmondshire. The land situation here was changed at this period by two events—the sale by the Crown to the City of London of three very large estates (Arkengarthdale, 1628; Bowes, 1634; Kirkby Ravensworth, 1625), originally members of the Honours of Richmond or Middleham, and the break-up of the great Scrope estate. As we have seen, for a long time the Lords Scrope, holding both their own landed power and the stewardship of the two great royal Honours, had been the mainstay of governmental influence in Richmondshire and the central pillar round which society gathered. All of this now dissolved rapidly. Emmanuel, Earl of Sunderland, died in December 1628, leaving as his heirs four illegitimate children. The Richmondshire estate was divided between the three daughters and their husbands. It is not surprising that Wentworth and his circle were intensely interested in these daughters. The wardship of one, Elizabeth, was granted in 1631 to Christopher Wandesford of Kirklington, who undoubtedly brought her up a solid Protestant. Nevertheless, in 1647 she married Thomas Savage, third Earl Rivers, a peer whose parents had been Catholics and in whose family Catholicism lingered on into the eighteenth century. Another of the sisters, Mary, took as her second husband Charles Powlett, sixth Marquis of Winchester and first Duke of Bolton—who was brought up a Catholic and apostatised.⁽²²⁾

The important group of Catholic squires in Gilling West had both losses and gains at this period—which cancelled each other out. The main line of the Wycliffes of Wycliffe came down to an heiress by 1611. Through her the Tunstalls acquired the estate. Probably as a result of this, the Tunstalls—who had hitherto lived mainly in Lancashire—moved wholly into the Riding, apparently exchanging their Lancashire property at Thurland with the Girlingtones, for Girlington and Thorpe. The net result was no loss of Catholic property here, but the vanishing from the Riding of the Wycliffes and Girlingtones and their replacement by the Tunstalls. Marmaduke Tunstall,

the heir, lived at Wycliffe, and although the rest of his family was solidly recusant, he remained a conformist to 1642. His recusant father paid a composition rent of about £100 a year; had Marmaduke been convicted the total would have been much higher. The Pudseys now made their West Riding properties in Bowland their principal seat, and Barforth (together with Stapleton and Hackforth) became dower-houses for recusant younger sons. At Stanwick the Cattericks were in financial difficulties. They sold Aldborough in 1619 and Stanwick in 1638, but were still living at Carlton in 1642. With the exception of Anthony Catterick of Carlton, who conformed in the 1630's, they remained solidly Catholic. But here again, their loss was not a Protestant gain. Stanwick was bought for £4,000 by Hugh Smithson, haberdasher of London. The Smithsons were a yeoman family who had long been tenants of the Cattericks. Hugh was not the first of the family to go into trade, and they had been steadily buying land well before 1638. Hugh's parents were recusants. We can discover nothing about his own religion, but most of his own children were Catholics. At Aldborough the Metcalfe family was solidly Catholic in 1642. At Mortham the Rokeby family vanished from the Catholic ranks in the decade before 1642. They were in increasing financial difficulties and sold Rokeby and other properties after 1610. Death effected a rapid clearance of the Catholic members of the family in 1631-2 and the new head of the family, Francis Rokeby, himself a recusant in 1615, conformed completely and brought up his children as Protestants. At West Layton the matriarch of the family was still a recusant in her old age in 1641. Catholicism remained strong amongst the women of the Gascoigne family of Sedbury, which lived in Richmond and elsewhere away from Sedbury at this period. Marrick remained a dower-house for recusant younger children of the Sayer family and for Catholic Bulmers, who started lead mines there at this period. Lastly, two new Catholic gentry families appeared, the Applebys of Lartington and Meynells of Dalton. The Applebys of Clove Lodge had long been a 'mere gentry' family, half in the wapentake and half in Co. Durham, with a tenuous Catholic past. Increasing

prosperity came to them, apparently from the practice of the law and from a marriage into the Lawson family of Brough. The marriage also brought an uncompromising Catholicism. In the few years before 1642 Ambrose Appleby bought Lartington and Linton on Ouse, followed his wife into recusancy and saw two sons ejected from Gray's Inn for persistent non-communicating. At Dalton George Meynell was in process of detaching Dalton from the main Meynell estate, consolidating it and founding a separate Catholic family. He clearly regarded conviction for recusancy and a composition fine as equivalent to the ruin of his modest designs. Hence, from 1606 to long after 1642, he avoided conviction by every possible shift, resorting even to repeated conformity. After this impressive catalogue of Catholic squires, it comes as something of an anticlimax to discover that Catholic numbers in the wapentake never reached 300 at this period, and that 60-70 were concentrated in one place, Stanwick.

As usual, Richmond town at this period had its dozen or so poor recusants and a very few dowagers of Catholic families living in retirement in leased houses. Around the 1620's a Wyvill dowager from Masham lived there. By the 1630's she was dead and replaced by 'Mrs Mullinax, widow and her maidservant, Mrs Mary Hutchinson, very old, and the wife of Robert Stapleton, papists'.

In Gilling East wapentake the number of recusants climbed painfully from 80 in the 1620's to about 100 in 1642. We get an impression that the ranks of the Catholic squirearchy here were thinning fast, but Catholic gentry influence buttressed by the fact that the unusually numerous dower-houses of outsider Catholics were better occupied by recusants at this period. Of the native squirearchy, the Withams of Cliffe, Frankes of Knighton and Smithsons of Cowton Grange (though these last were not armigerous) were fairly solidly Catholic. The Withams, with their constant interest in augmenting their income by estate agency and the law, were doing more than holding their own financially. They also came, by marriage, into a share of the Wycliffe inheritance. The Frankes were heavily in debt. Indeed, bankruptcy had haunted them for a long time—the

heralds in 1585 had reported hastily that they had sold out. Yet they survived somehow and the heir, Marmaduke Franke, evaded composition by remaining a conformist. The Lascelles family were in a worse state still. They had sold Sowerby, Thirsk, by 1604 and succumbed to the temptation to sell Breckenbrough in 1624 to Sir Arthur Ingram when he was building his empire in the county. Hence the family vanished from the wapentake in 1624. The Conyers family vanished from their farm at Danby Wiske in the early 1620's. The Nortons seem to have sold out at Cloubeck by 1620 and retired to the Ripon area. Mrs Norton, their dowager, and remarkable as a Boynton of Barmston who was a determined Catholic recusant, lived on at Cloubeck until 1617. Thus, of the six original local Catholic gentry families, three remained in 1642. Thirntoft at this period was almost constantly occupied by the wealthy Catholic Middletons of Stockeld in the West Riding. Various members of the Pudsey family also sought the relative obscurity of small estates here, at Stapleton and Hackforth. Hackforth was bought by Thomas Pudsey, a Catholic attorney. He himself practised all his professional arts to save his estate from fining, and was reputed to be chief legal adviser to Yorkshire Catholics. Danby Wiske had been acquired by Sir George Calvert in 1616. We have already noted his early Catholic upbringing and Protestant education. By 1625 he was an open Catholic, protected from conviction and fining by royal letters of protection, and raised to the peerage as first Lord Baltimore. It is therefore not surprising that it is not from presentments but from the Lisbon College register that we learn that his son Philip Calvert, who entered the college in 1642, was born at Danby Wiske. Finally Gilling East contained its due share of 'vagrant' Catholic gentry and 'mere gentry'—like the Burnetts and Cleasbys. It also contained strange marginal phenomena—for instance at East Cowton. There the property of Long Cowton was bought by a Newcastle merchant, Sir Henry Anderson, who was suspected of recusancy in the 1650's.⁽²³⁾

Hang West wapentake, with its heavy concentration of Scrope and Crown estates, was much affected by the decline of those two powers. Thus much Crown land in Aysgarth and

Middleham was sold to the City of London in 1628. But if the wider background was shifting, the foreground of the Catholic squirearchy substantially endured, its losses cancelled out by gains. Of the four major pillars one vanished at this period. The Tophams of Agglethorpe, generation after generation, found the means from their practice of the law to buy land and avert disasters. Within the family strong Catholic influences battled with an equally strong sense of self-preservation. In 1642 the head of the family, Francis Topham, was a recusant compounder, his wife a Protestant; his heir, Edward, was perhaps still at Gray's Inn and married to a determinedly Catholic Middleton of Stockeld. The religion of other members of the family was part-Catholic, part-doubtful. At Constable Burton the head of the Wyvill family was an approved Protestant knight and official, his wife a strong Catholic and the rest of the family divided like the Tophams. At Danby and Spennithorne the same battle went on within the cadet branch of the Scrope family. Francis Scrope, the head of the family to his death in 1626, was—at least in adult life—never a recusant or non-communicant, though that did not lead him to office. His wife, Dorothy, a Catterick, was always a strong recusant. She separated from him early in their married life and lived at Calvis, Thornton-le-Street. Most of the rest of the family were recusants. Francis' younger brother Christopher succeeded to the estate in 1626. He and his wife (a Beseley of Overton) were recusants until 1616 certainly and perhaps until as late as 1626, but escaped composition completely and seem to have conformed. In the 1620's it was very much in the balance whether Catholicism would survive in the family. The eldest son, Henry, made a Catholic marriage in about 1626. He himself never seems to have been convicted as a recusant. By 1631 he embarked on a series of suits to prove that this was no marriage—in the York Chancery Court and in the Star Chamber. The documentation of this matter is scanty, but it seems likely that the York authorities annulled his Catholic marriage and that he contracted another union. His next brother, Francis, was admitted as a pensioner to the notoriously Puritan Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, in 1623—the year in which his next brother,

John, entered the English College, Douai, as a convictor. John died at school; Francis left Cambridge to make a Catholic marriage, he once convicted as a recusant in 1626 and thereafter, apparently, to lapse. Another brother, Thomas, was never a recusant. At least one of their sisters was a Catholic. By the 1630's death had removed (without heirs) Henry and Francis, and the estate passed to their brothers, Thomas and Simon. Thomas, as we have seen, was a conformist, and soon died without heirs. Simon, the sole surviving brother, therefore gained all. He had been neither to Cambridge nor to Douai and appears in no presentments until he was convicted in 1636. At the outbreak of the Civil War he was most probably living at East Bridgford in Nottinghamshire and still not a compounder and unmarried.⁽²⁴⁾

The Thoresby family of Barden vanish from the presentments and most likely sold their lands and left the district. Of the lesser Catholic gentry, the Swales of Grinton and Waites of Leyburn remained quite strongly Catholic to 1642. The Metcalfes of Bear Park, Aysgarth seem to have sold their property. Finally, as a modest balance to this tale of Catholic uncertainties and losses, Anthony Frankland and his wife (from Aldwark in Bulmer), both recusants from 1636 to 1641, established themselves at Ellerton, Downholme; two new mere gentry Catholic families appeared, the Crofts at Middleham and Horners at East Witton.

The fate of recusancy in Hang East Wapentake was very similar. Of the eight Catholic gentry families of real consequence in 1604 five were missing in 1642. The Clebornes had lapsed early, the Normavilles perhaps left the area, the Darcys were transformed by Sir Conyers Darcy into a solidly Protestant family, the Girlingtons had left for Lancashire, the Metcalfes of Hornby died out with Oswald Metcalfe's ('aged senceless and a non-communicant') death in 1604. The remaining three pillar-families were not equally secure. By far the securest were the Lawsons of Brough, Catterick. Sir Ralph Lawson, head of the family to 1623, was a man of many parts. He owned extensive coal-mining properties near Newcastle,

built up his grasp on the Catterick area by marriage and buying land, and was a noted lawyer. Thus he was—with Sir Robert Dolman of Gunby, another attorney and devout Catholic—legal adviser to the Earl of Lennox and steward of his Yorkshire estates. This legal connection long remained with the family and saved them many difficulties as Catholics. He himself was never convicted as a recusant, though his wife was. His eldest son, Roger, seems to have lived on the Newcastle properties, where his wife, the famous Mrs Dorothy Lawson, maintained at St Anthony's, a devout 'monastic' household quite the equal of Osgodby. Their son, Henry, was not convicted as a recusant in the Riding until 1630 and succeeded in proving that he was only the legal owner of a small part of the estate. Otherwise the family was solidly Catholic and had strong connections with the convents abroad. The Danby family remained quite strongly Catholic until the death of the head of the family, Christopher, in 1624 and his mother, Mrs Elizabeth Danby of Thorpe Perrow, in 1629. Numerous younger members of the family and cadets in and around Masham were recusants in the 1620's. Christopher was an unhappy, unwise man and an ill-manager of his great estate. He quarrelled with his wife, who was most often living apart from him, committed his affairs to a fraudulent (Catholic) member of his family as steward, was forced to sell land to pay his debts. It seems that, in his later years, he lapsed into Church-papistry. As we have seen, his elder son and heir, Thomas Danby, was brought up by the Wandesfords as a determined Protestant. However some Catholicism remained in the family even after 1642. Thomas' sister, Katherine, was married off in 1629 to a Protestant, Sir Francis Armitage of Kirklees. Though she was never presented for recusancy, it is significant that she and her husband married two of their three sons to strong Catholics. Also a cadet branch of the Danbys at South Cave remained recusants to at least 1646. The third remaining pillar-family was the Wyvills of Masham—a part-Catholic family whom we have already dealt with. As a small compensation for the wavering of the pillars, this period saw the arrival in the area of the Nortons of Masham, the Townleys of Patrick

Brompton, the Metcalfes of Firby and Covells of Hornby. Of these the Townleys were vagrants from Lancashire and birds of passage, the Nortons (from Wath, Ripon to Swinton) were only recusants on the female side, so were the Covells; the Metcalfes alone were solidly Catholic and settled at Firby. We should perhaps add the Lords Baltimore to this list of newcomers. In 1620 the future first Lord Baltimore bought Kiplin and the Hall there was under construction by 1622. He appointed his father, Leonard Calvert, as his attorney at the buying of Kiplin. In 1625 Leonard Calvert, Esq., and his wife Grace were recusants at Kiplin. Apart from this there is no trace of the family in Kiplin presentments at this or any subsequent period, and we get the impression that the Lords Baltimore never paid the Hall more than occasional short visits.⁽²⁵⁾

The pattern was repeated in Hallikeld. Of the four pillar-families of 1604, the Tankards stood firm. Thomas Tankard, the head of the family, petitioned the King in 1637 to reduce his recusancy composition which was ruining him. He pleaded that 'having a charge of children and his debts daily increasing, (he) has thereupon been forced to give over house-keeping and sell a great part of his lands so compounded for and yet the gross of his debts not satisfied'. He enclosed testimonials in his favour from ten Protestant gentry, including Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax of Denton. Wentworth's Commissioners had fixed his composition rent on a sliding scale, to take in increases in his income as annuities out of the estate ceased. The full total was nearly £200 a year, on an estate which was valued in 1641 at £714 a year. In that year he and his family were living in York. As we shall see, he had not sold his main properties, and the family was to survive a far worse financial levy for its recusancy during the inter-regnum. The Mitchells of Newton, a mere gentry family, remained strongly Catholic to 1642. The Gatenbys and the Meynells of Pickhill vanished from presentments—the Gatenbys by selling out, the Meynells by the reduction of their house to the status of an outlying property of the Meynell of Kilvington estate. In their place there appeared in the Catholic ranks the Bierleys of Nosterfield and Grants of Pickhill, both quite solidly Catholic

families. Also at Pickhill, a cadet branch of the Wandesfords was recusant on the female side down to 1637 and then conformed. At Gatenby Henry Warcop, son of the martyr, conformed finally in 1616, and a Durham vagrant gentry family, the Claptons, appeared for some years in the 1620's.

We can draw some conclusions after this detailed survey of Richmondshire recusancy. The ranks of the Catholic gentry contained a few in a state of financial collapse (the Cattericks, Frankes, Lascelles), a few who prospered—most out of the practice of the law (Lawsons, Applebys, Swales, Tophams), but some out of trade (the Smithsons) or industry (Lawsons—coal mining, Bulmers of Marrick—lead mining). However, the majority stood up with difficulty to a period of financial stress. It is clear that business success in a Catholic family was almost always accompanied by a large evasion of fines through legal shifts and even conformism by the senior males of the family. Church-papistry was still very widespread. It sometimes reached an extraordinary degree—for instance in 1630 a son of Richard Braithwaite of Catterick was admitted to Douai. The father was in process of buying Catterick and moving his family from Westmorland and was said by the son to be a Protestant and the mother a Catholic. Yet none of the family appear in presentments up to 1642. We can see the working of a slow tendency towards the consolidation of the Catholic squirearchy—the more complete catholicisation of a hard-core of families and the fading away of Church-papistry and marginal Catholics. But the tendency only began to operate after 1620 and still had not gone far by 1642.

In Allertonshire the 70 Catholics of 1604 had become 145 by the 1620's and 180–190 by 1642. The Catholic squirearchy, remarkably strong here, held its own down to 1642, successfully replacing its losses. Of the eight pillar-families of 1604, two were removed by natural causes; the Conyers of Hutton Bonville sold out in 1636 and the Conyers of Sockburne were reduced to heiresses in 1635, whose trustees sold out. In neither case are we entitled, on our scanty evidence, to judge that they were ruined by fining. The Hutton family—of whom there is no adequate pedigree—were always poor and had roots in Co. Durham.

Some of the family remained as recusants in Hutton in 1642 and long afterwards, and others had already removed to Co. Durham. Sockburn continued to be a strongly recusant parish. The Meynells of North Kilvington—whose fortunes at this period we have already discussed—remained very solid Catholics and weathered much increased recusancy fines, partly by legal skill, partly by a radical enclosure of Kilvington. The Talbots of Thornton-le-Street were wavering in the Faith by 1642 and only the women of the family were now recusants. The Jacksons of Knayton (lawyers), the Greenes of Lanmoth, Leake, the Sayers of Worsall (also landowners in Co. Durham), the Metcalfes of North Ottrington, all remained solidly recusant. The gaps were filled by the Danbys of Leake, Pinckneys of Nether Silton, Metcalfes of Romanby, who were all strongly Catholic by 1642—and, at least temporarily, by the Lowickes of Osmotherley and Bowes of Ellerbeck, whose recusancy there faded out by the 1630's (though perhaps was continued elsewhere, in Cleveland, by members of the families).

Our table of Catholics in Langbaurch for this period is:

	1604	1620's	1642
East Langbaurch	131	170	200
West Langbaurch	214	285	285
Whitby Strand	100	68	56
	<hr/>		
Totals	445	523	541
	<hr/>		

Considering the extent of Langbaurch, these numbers were still extremely small. Although Catholics remained widely spread in incidence, the process of consolidation into larger congregations advanced in the decades before 1642. Thus eight congregations then contained 392 of the 541 Catholics. The Catholic gentry of this area underwent more changes than those of the other wapentakes. In 1604 there had been fifteen gentry families (if we include 'mere gentry') affected by Catholicism. In 1642 there were twenty-one. But of the original fifteen seven dropped out before 1642. The Inglebys sold Hutton Rudby to Sir Arthur Ingram in 1633-4 and retired to their other houses at Lawkland

and Ripon in the West Riding—yet the house at Hutton Rudby was leased by Catholic trustees for Mary Ward and her community in 1642. The Rokebys gave up their holding in Marske by 1616 and seem to have become vagrants at Stainton, Manfield in Richmondshire and probably in Co. Durham. There seems to be no particular reason for thinking that either of these departures was solely due to recusancy fines. Presentments of the Gowers of Stainsby cease after 1623, but until the family pedigree is worked out and various Gower recusants found elsewhere in Cleveland after that date identified, we are in no position to say that the family conformed. The Yowards of Westerdale certainly got Catholicism out of their system by 1620. Mrs Strangways of Acklam, the only recusant member of her family, died by 1613. Presentments of the Wildons of Marton cease after 1612. The timid non-communicating of the Trotters of Skelton Castle ended shortly after 1604. The survivors in 1642 of the families of 1604 were eight in number. The Crathornes of Crathorne and Ness were solid descendants of medieval owners of Crathorne. While most of the rest of his family were recusants, the head, Thomas Crathorne, successfully himself dodged fines for many years. He was probably assisted by a mysterious Francis More, gent., long a recusant sojourner in his house, who acted as his attorney—and whom it would be tempting to connect with the lawyer Mores of Angram Grange. Thomas was assaulted in 1605–6 by Thornborough's Recusancy Commissioners, who procured his conviction at the Middlesex Quarter Sessions. Thomas conformed. In 1607 he took the Oath of Allegiance. In 1634 he was again convicted, this time at the North Riding Quarter Sessions, and most probably as the result of informations. He and his heir, Ralph of Ness, were both subjected to recusancy compositions of £45. Another 'survivor family', the Tocketts of Tocketts, Guisborough, endured a very heavy fining and their estate was for some time personally farmed by Heaton. By 1632 the head of the family, Roger Tocketts, was a conformist with a recusant wife, for whom he paid a composition of only £5 a year, while his brothers were recusant compounders for very small rents. The Salvins of Newbiggin, Egton, remained fairly solidly recusant

throughout, though in the 1620's they abandoned 'house-keeping' there and lived at Cawton in Ryedale. From 1632 composition rents of about £70 a year were levied from their estate. Also amongst the survivors were the Radcliffe family of Ugthorpe, who were slowly sinking in the social scale throughout these years. In 1636 they sold their last major possession, the manor of Ugthorpe, but continued to live in the neighbourhood as recusants. Even as late as 1621, as long as Katherine Radcliffe lived, Lythe was almost an Osgodby or St Anthony's, Newcastle, sheltering a round dozen of vagrant Catholic gentry relations—Hardings and Ridleys from the north, Readmans (by 1642 sunk to the status of yeomen at Mulgrave), Fulthorpes, Salvins, Lady Ann Ingleby. The list of surviving families is rounded off by the Fairfaxes of Dunsley, Smiths of Egton, Bowes of Appleton, Aislabys (who moved from Fyling Hall when it was sold by the Cholmleys in 1634, and settled at Barwick on Tees) and Meynells of Hilton and Hawnby (who remained recusant on the female side).

On the other hand there were a dozen newcomers to the ranks of the Langbaugh Catholic gentry. The Fosters of Earswick bought Stokesley from Lord Eure in 1623 and moved there, still solidly recusant. Richard Foster was able to use his position in the Queen's household to have his recusancy composition reduced to a merely nominal sum. The Bulmers moved from Co. Durham to Wilton in 1624 and henceforward gravitated between Wilton and Marrick in Richmondshire. Sir Bertram, the head of this recusant family, we have already met as a Church-papist, a business man (his lead mines at Marrick) and a trustee of secular priest funds. The Cockrells of Stakesby became more and more solidly recusant after 1623, though their menfolk avoided conviction until 1635. An independent branch of the Meynell family appeared as recusants of a furtive kind at Broughton after 1626. Yet another recusant branch of the Pudseys settled at Pickton in about 1620. Two quite solidly recusant Middleton families sprang up in the 1620's, at Middleton on Leaven and Middleton in Hilton. In Appleton Wiske a recusant gentry family of Bests was established by the 1620's. In 1632 an attempt to get them to

compound with Wentworth was foiled by temporary flight to London. The Metcalfes of Hood Grange, Kilburn moved to live at Tanton, Stokesley, by the 1630's. An unidentified branch of the Gascoigne family settled at Hilton. At Ingleby Greenhow an Ascough family from Co. Durham moved in by 1632 and compounded. At Normanby a mere gentry family, the Addisons, became quite solidly recusant by 1642. This list, however, is not quite exhaustive. John Errington, a northern vagrant, compounded at Yarm in 1632. The Ashleys of Maltby were in part recusant in the 1620's. Various members of the Metham family from the East Riding appeared as vagrant recusants on and off throughout this period, at Kilton and Whitby. In the 1620's and 1630's Simon Rymer, gent., was a 'dangerous seducing recusant' at Pickton. Odd members of the Thwing, Lascelles and Fairfax families appeared as vagrants in half a dozen places. In 1632 Thomas Challoner, gent., and his wife were recusants at Guisborough. In 1641 the churchwardens of Bowlby presented Sir Robert Conyers and his wife as recent recusants. But the most interesting case was Robert Rainer, M.D. In 1624 his wife was a recusant at Appleton Wiske. The following year Dr Robert voluntarily took the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance at Yarm where he was then resident. But in 1629 he was presented as a recusant at Danby in Cleveland.

In Whitby Strand the definite apostasy of the Cholmleys removed their direct support of Catholicism. But, as we have seen, for long after 1604 their attitude towards recusant tenants was fairly indulgent. However the decades before the civil wars were a period of financial trouble for the family. In 1613 they sold Ugglebarnby and Eskdaleside, in 1622 sold Normanby in Fylingdales and in 1634 the Fyling Hall estate. As a result of the lawsuits with Hoby, Hackness was detached from the jurisdiction of the Cholmleys' Whitby Strand liberty courts. By 1642 the number of popish recusants in the Strand was little more than half of what it had been in 1604 and there were no more than a dozen in Whitby itself, where the Salvins of Newbiggin had a house. Dependents of the Cockrells of Stakesby and Fairfaxes of Dunsley accounted for a sizeable proportion of the rest. As usual we are at a loss to

count recusants in Scarborough at this period and to distinguish them, in the scanty presentments, from idle mariners and sectaries. By the 1630's the Wolfe family—relatives of the Jesuit—were partly Catholic. But we have no real clue as to the religion of William Lawson, a shipmaster on the Rotterdam trade, who rarely came to church, or Nicholas Brearcliffe who peremptorily refused to go to church, or Mrs Alleyn and Mrs Eleanor Conyers who frequently missed church in the 1620's and 1630's. Puritan interests were clearly hard at work. Sir Thomas Hoby had a finger in many pies, took infinite pains to get a sound Puritan preacher into the town, and helped the equally devout Darleys of Buttercrambe to refound the grammar school and choose suitable masters. The Common Council, for its part, banned all other teaching in the town, and Church and State were so united that they could insist that all who refused to pay Easter dues should be excommunicated from the parish church communion table. The town's solicitors looking after its interests at Westminster were Christopher and Francis Thompson. Their letters to the bailiffs are usually headed 'Jesus' (no monopoly of Catholic recusants) or 'Emmanuel' and end by commending the bailiffs to 'the Lord of Hosts'. Any Catholics able to live in this rather close atmosphere could look to nearby Catholic gentry. The Babthorpes lived at Folkton for some years early in James I's reign and were on amiable terms with the Thompsons. Nearer still, and resident throughout this period, were the Catholic Constables of Carethorpe in the East Riding. At a later date certainly, and probably also now, they helped priests to minister in Scarborough. Much in the town also was Roger Wyvill of Osgodby, the North Riding Justice—indeed, his son who entered Douai was born in Scarborough.⁽²⁶⁾

In the liberty of Pickering Lythe the Cholmley power now declined. They sold Roxby itself by 1612, Lund Grange in 1600 and Kingthorpe Grange soon after 1640. The total numbers of recusants in the Lythe never exceeded fifty at this period, yet there was a modest increase in the total of Catholic gentry. Of the five 'pillar families' of 1604, only one (the Duttons of Goathland and Pickering) vanished by 1642. That was natural, since they

had only been vagrants, living on an annuity from the Cholmleys. The other four stood, somewhat shakily. The Wyvills of Osgodby maintained their mysterious and tenuous marginal Catholicism. The Percehays of Ryton behaved in much the same fashion, though Thomas Percehay, head of the family in the 1620's, ended his days with a short burst of defiant open recusancy which landed him in gaol in 1626, the year of his death. His heir, Christopher, was a conformist and joined Roger Wyvill on the Bench shortly before 1642. Both families sent a son to Douai. The Hunters of Pickering were several shades more Catholic than they; in general only their women were recusants, except for a brief patch of recusancy amongst the men of the family after 1635—no doubt involuntary and induced by the attentions of Wentworth's informers. At Wykeham the fourth pillar family, the Hartons, became more homogeneously recusant after 1630. Then there were five newcomers. At Pickering the Elringtons from Whitby settled in the mid-1630's and were determined recusants. At Ellerburn the Wiles family became in part recusant from 1623 onwards. At Osgodby men of the Beilby family (perhaps vagrants) appeared in recusancy presentments in 1607-8 and 1633. At Seamer (and later at Lebberston) the Coulsons appeared as steady recusants and compounders from 1630. As everywhere, a few vagrants from other areas sought temporary refuge—the Salvins of Newbiggin lived at Thornton-le-Dale from 1622 to 1624 before moving to Gilling in Ryedale; a family of Hebburns (perhaps from the north) appeared in Middleton in 1620; Marmaduke Raysin (no doubt from Amotherby, Ryedale) was at Ryton in 1630-2 and Mrs Nendyke at Sinnington in 1612-3.

In Birdforth Wapentake Catholicism at this period hardly flourished—the total number of recusants did not exceed 130—but we notice the same changes in the Catholic gentry. Of the nine gentry families here which had been in some degree affected by Catholicism in 1604, one vanished long before 1642. The Harringtons of Mount St John moved back into York. The other eight families were still here in 1642 and still tending towards popery. Far and away the wealthiest of them was the Bellasis family of Newburgh Priory, Coxwold. Each successive head of

this family from the first settler, Sir William, to the Earls Fauconberg of the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, displayed business acumen and they were, on the whole, very fortunate. They bought land steadily, if not spectacularly, and amassed a considerable money capital. We can detect no dazzling coups—like the series of almost Hapsburg marriage alliances which hoisted their relations, the Darcys of Hornby, rapidly to wealth and a peerage by 1642. There is no sign that the Bellasises at this period made money from the law or commerce (though the first Lord Fauconberg did have some—certainly long unproductive—shares in American colonial enterprises) or from any major offices, nor that they made any very profitable marriages. (The first Lord married a Cholmley.) It was most likely a steady seizing of opportunities, to enclose commons, buy up properties cheaply and exploit them (Yarm, Alne lordship and demesnes, Sutton on the Forest and Easingwold manors, Over Silton and Kepwick acquired from the bankrupt Leptons). Their activities were not confined to the Riding or Yorkshire. We are not surprised to notice that they married into the Darcy, Ingram and Slingsby families—perhaps the three most pushing gentry families in Yorkshire of these years. This is the unexpected background to a tenuous but remarkably persistent tendency towards Catholicism in the Bellasis family. Unusually, it owed almost nothing to Catholic wives. Sir Henry bought a baronetcy. His son, Sir Thomas, early contracted what may well have been a secret Catholic marriage. In 1615, according to his second son, John, he was received into the Church, but certainly lapsed speedily into conformism and sent the same John to be educated in the very Protestant Darcy household. All of his children seem to have been married off to Protestants. In 1627 he was on Buckingham's side and thereby gained—at a price—an English barony. The next year Buckingham was dead and his party out of office. Fauconberg and his eldest son, Henry, revolted furiously against Wentworth's 'provincial government' and paid for it. It was at this opposition period that they were noted for associating with the Catholic gentry. In 1643 Lord Fauconberg was raised to a viscounty for war services. But there was still nothing tangible

to lead men to suspect that he would die ten years later a Catholic recusant or that the future headship of the family lay with his one son (John) and one grandson (Henry's younger son, Rowland) who were later to be Catholics.⁽²⁷⁾

The Meynells of Hawnby had risen to landed wealth through the law in an earlier generation and now became bankrupt by sheer mismanagement and sold most of their land by 1623—appropriately to the Morleys who were rising fast on the profits of a clerkship in Chancery, and who were themselves to collapse a generation later. A tenuous Catholicism, confined to the women of the family, lingered amongst the Meynells, who stayed at Hawnby long after 1623. Recusancy fines can have played very little part in their ruin. At South Otterington the Talbots remained fairly solidly recusant. At Kirkby Knowle the descendants of Joseph Constable remained recusant on the female side until 1623, when John Constable was convicted and the family was thenceforward more determinedly recusant. Although the Metcalfes of Hood Grange, Kilburn had moved their main interests to Firby and Tanton, Leonard Metcalfe and his family remained solidly recusant at Hood until 1633. It is possible that the lease of the grange was then not renewed and that the survivors of his family withdrew from this area. The Bowes of Angram Grange, Welbury, were still in part recusant and the estate under seizure in 1606. Soon after that a successor to the Grange, Thomas Bowes (who had himself conformed in 1599) must have ended the seizure. He remained a conformist, sold the bulk of the estate by 1624, and, surprisingly, in his impoverished old age in 1633 was reconvicted as a recusant. The Lockwoods of Sowerby, Thirsk, in spite of the two priests in the family, were only recusant on the female side until 1632 when Richard Lockwood—probably owing to Wentworth's informers—was convicted as a recusant. He endured a composition rent down to 1642 and then conformed. Lancelot Brand of Sutton under Whitestone Cliff, a recusant in 1604, appears repeatedly as a vagrant 'seducing recusant' in and around Thirsk and Kirkby Knowle until 1630, when we lose sight of him.

The gaps and weaknesses amongst the Birdforth Catholic gentry

were compensated for by the appearance of nine new families in their ranks. No less than four of these were in East Harlsey: the Granges (a family of modestly rising lawyers, who bought the main manor here in 1610, when they were already sending sons overseas to Catholic colleges, began to be convicted on the female side from 1613 and were quite solidly recusant by 1630-42); the Wilsons of Morton Grange (whose womenfolk only were recusants down to 1627); the Bests (from 1628); and a branch of the Addisons of Normanby in Cleveland, who arrived in 1636 and were solid recusants. There seems to be some connection between this colony at East Harlsey and the Lady Chapel of Mount Grace close by. The Lady Chapel was built shortly before the dissolution of Mount Grace by the joint efforts of the last Carthusian Prior and Lord Clifford. What we know of the characteristics of the Mount Grace community in those days inclines us to think that the chapel commemorated a vision of our Lady on the spot by one of the monks. There was no intention that a monk should serve the chapel—it was, in fact, during its brief period of use, served by non-monk priests and then occupied by the Prior for a few years before he left for Sheen Anglorum. Thereafter it became a ruin. No evidence has yet been found that the chapel was ever a popular place of pilgrimage at any time in the sixteenth century. In 1614 the York High Commissioners made a short-lived foray against surviving popular superstitions in Allertonshire and Birdforth—particularly pilgrimages to the Lady Chapel and praying at the stumps of destroyed standing crosses at Dishforth and Thornton le Beans. A special warrant was issued to William Blanchard, a messenger of the Commission, to arrest pilgrims. The warrant says that the practice has a past ('... have frequented and still do frequent . . .'), that it is regarded as a 'pilgrimage', that Catholics gather there at night, 'upon the Ladys and other saints eves and certain other set and appointed times by the people of that country observed and noted'. On 'the Ladys eve', 7 September 1614, the messenger caught sixteen Catholics there at their prayers and put them in £50 bonds to attend the court. Marmaduke Lodge of Appleton Wiske was taken 'with certain popish books and other superstitious thinges

found aboute him', refused the Oath of Allegiance and was gaoled to await the Assizes. The rest were a party of women and children, Conyers of Hutton Bonville, Lowickes of Osmotherley, Simpsons of Little Smeaton, Bowes of Ellerbeck, Wilsons of Morton Grange, Christabel Gaterd, widow of Yafforth in Richmondshire, and two women from Northallerton. They admitted praying at the chapel and were put on bond to perform a humiliating public penance on market day at Northallerton town cross. In fact few of them did this and the case was not followed up vigorously. The affair was written up at length in the court book and each appearance of the parties noted in the margin as 'Pilgrimes'. But there seems to be no other reference in the York court books to Mount Grace; nor, oddly enough, does Thomas Meynell mention it in his commonplace book. He must have known the chapel well. It lay close to the much frequented racecourse at Hambledon at which he usually ran horses—and which no doubt gave cover for Catholics visiting the chapel. Thomas also owned property close by at Cold Kirkby—eventually, and probably even then, a village full of stables and racing associations. He was very devout to our Lady; he was interested in old Catholic chapels—particularly those at Whitby and Thornton le Beans. There is a variety of evidence that the pilgrimage to Mount Grace was steadily gaining in popularity amongst Catholics in the last decades before the civil wars precisely when Thomas was writing. Thus the Wigmores MS *Life of Mary Ward* remarks that Mary and her little party of religious arrived at the hall at Hutton Rudby 'le jour de l'exaltation de la sainte croix lan 1642', that she fell ill and attributed her cure, in 'my octobre' to 'un pelerinage qui se fit pour elle audit lieu de Montgrace qui est de tres grande devotion Jusques a aujourd'hui et on . . . obtient beaucoup de faveurs de ciel', although the chapel was then roofless and on a high hill, exposed to 'de tres grands et tres rudes vents'. There one sees 'catholiques qui prient des heures de suite'. Mary Ward, once recovered, wished to make the pilgrimage herself, but the account does not say whether she did. As we shall see, pilgrims went there during the Interregnum and a Franciscan convent was established at

Osmotherley (and a convent of nuns projected) after the Restoration, to care for them.⁽²⁸⁾

Other newcomer Catholics in Birdforth were Mrs Nelson of Thorpfield, Thirsk (a recusant from 1615 to her conformity in 1636), Mrs Ascough of Kepwick (from 1611 to her conformity in 1618, and male members of the family later), the Rosses of Kilburn (recusants from 1637), the Bowes of Hawaby (recusants from 1615). In a class of their own were the Leptons of Kepwick. There had been very faint traces of Catholicism in the family at an earlier period. From 1634 to 1637 Ann, wife of Thomas Lepton, was a recusant—just as the family was going bankrupt and selling out to Lord Fauconberg in return for small annuities. After 1637 husband and wife, she a recusant, were taken into the household of the very Catholic Anne family at Frickley in the West Riding. The wapentake had its share of vagrants, of whom the most interesting were the wife of Sir Ralph Constable at Upsall in 1614-6, Ralph Neville at Kirkby Knowle in 1616, and several of Thomas Meynell's children at Upsall in 1640-1.

The same general pattern is repeated once more in Bulmer Wapentake. Here there were some 120-30 recusants and a proliferation of gentry amongst them. Of ten gentry families affected by Catholicism in 1604 only five remained in place in 1642. Of the survivors the Cholmleys of Brandsby were undoubtedly the strongest Catholics. This family had taken root, as we have seen, as a result of an explosive quarrel amongst the Cholmleys of Whitby, and had remained Catholic when the parent-stem apostatised. Until 1607 Richard Cholmley avoided conviction and fining by living at Ingleton in the remoter parts of the West Riding, but Thornborough's Commission then caught up with him and secured his conviction at the Middlesex Quarter Sessions. Thereafter all the family were convicted recusants. They endured a good deal. In 1609 two priests were caught in their house and Richard only secured a pardon for the capital felony by paying £1,500 to a courtier, the Earl of Montgomery. This disaster was followed by two prosecutions for Catholic marriages and by fines of £900 for harbouring Catholic servants between 1624 and 1627. The Cholmleys did not collapse into

conformism, pleaded their royal pardon in the marriage cases, and made full use of their debts and pretty constant dowagers' portions to secure a comparatively low recusancy composition from 1627-9—and, no doubt, then also compounded for the harbouring fines at a low rate. By 1642 they were battered, had had to sell a little land, and were probably still in debt, but had survived. The Bartons of Whenby, Marton, Farlington and Towthorpe gradually emerged from 1623-6 as equally determined and solid recusants and compounders. The Thwings of Heworth were still more determined. The descendants of John Thwing, the Elizabethan Catholic rebel, seem to have been Protestant and carried Upper Helmsley away from the family through an heiress, who eventually married Henry Fairfax of Gilling, the ex-Jesuit apostate. But John Thwing's younger brother, Thomas Thwing of Heworth, was a strong recusant at the age of ninety in 1614. His children were, apparently, all Catholics (they included the martyr priest, Edward Thwing). His eldest son, William Thwing, began life as a 'dangerous recusant', but conformed under pressure in Lancashire in the 1590's. He does not seem to appear again in presentments, but his will in 1635 leaves money openly for prayers for his soul. His Lancashire wife was a steady recusant, as were most of his children. His eldest son, George Thwing, married into the strongly Catholic Gascoigne of Parlington family. In earlier life he dodged conviction for recusancy by moving about a great deal. In 1626 a charge of helping to harbour a priest at Roundhay, Leeds, lay over him and it is possible that he made some gestures of conformity. But in 1631 he was faced with conviction and a recusancy composition, and hesitated—he actually appeared at Quarter Sessions, offered to take the Oath of Allegiance and then left the court hastily without leave before it could be put before him. In the event he was convicted and compounded in 1632, and was presented as a recusant in 1634 and 1637. By 1640 it seems that he was again making gestures of conformity to get his composition removed, and his wife was with her parents at Parlington. This was far from being the end of his twists and turns in trying to escape fining while remaining a Catholic. As we shall see, his children were mostly very deter-

mined Catholics; two were companions of Mary Ward and one was Thomas Thwing, the priest martyr. Also amongst the Bulmer survivor families from 1604 were the Methams of Wigganthorpe. Jordan Metham himself remained a non-communicant, except for one brief period of recusancy around 1637-40. In 1632 the Terrington churchwardens reported his airy excuse that the communion wine was undrinkable because it arrived in the parish in beer bottles. His wife and children were recusants. The last survivor was Mrs Jane Allanson of Sandhutton, Bossall. She began her career as a recusant as the wife of Nicholas Fairfax (of the Dunsley, Whitby, family) and later remarried to Thomas Allanson. She was a considerable heiress—to Sandhutton from her own family (the Hungates) and to part of Dunsley and Garrowby by marriage. This was undoubtedly the reason for her extraordinary series of manoeuvres. In 1611 she took the Oath of Allegiance but did not conform. She contrived to pass the Sandhutton and Dunsley estates off as the property of her children and was only fined on her Garrowby dower. Thomas Allanson was himself most circumspect and was never convicted as a recusant though much suspected. In August 1632 Jane compounded with Wentworth for a rent of £10 a year. The following month she got herself absolved from excommunication by certifying that she had attended service once in York Minister—but rapidly reverted to recusancy and remained in that state until at least 1641. Her elder son married a Thwing and was a strong recusant; but her second son, who inherited the Dunsley property appears in no presentments, made a very Protestant marriage and settled down to conformism himself.

The five vanished pillar-families were the Wildons of Mowthorpe (who perhaps moved to York and elsewhere), the Beseleys (fairly steadily recusant until 1628, when they sold out and removed), the Holmes of Huntington (who were still recusant on the female side in 1607 when Seth Holme sold the manor and moved away, we do not know where), the Whalleys (who were only birds of passage and soon moved) and the Fosters of Earswick (who removed to Stokesley, as we have already seen). We have no reason to believe that these sales were due to the pressure of

recusancy fines—none of these families occur in the Pipe Roll book of Yorkshire recusants of 1605-6 from whom the sheriff was bound to collect fine money; there is little sign that they suffered much of this sort before or after then.

To replace these five there were six newcomers, not all of whom persevered. It is at this period that the Stricklands of Sizergh began to make steady use of their house at Thornton Bridge, Brafferton. Sir Thomas Strickland (1563-1612) was the able son of a highly acquisitive father, who had amassed considerable property holdings in Yorkshire by marriage, by lead mining and speculation in wardships. There is no doubt whatever that, in this case, Catholicism was introduced into the family and maintained—against the grain—by a series of marriages to determinedly Catholic wives. Sir Thomas was closely associated with the strongly Protestant Boyntons of Barmston. But his second wife, a Curwen, was a strong Catholic. As a result their younger sons were brought up as Catholics (two of them at Douai), while one daughter (the wife of a Catholic, Sir William Webb, equerry to the Prince of Wales) was a recusant and the other a Protestant. The eldest son, Sir Robert Strickland, seems to have stayed frequently at Thornton Bridge. He married a definite Protestant and, by 1642, his household was free from all trace of Catholicism—but this was not the end of the story. In these years, until 1624, Thornton Bridge knew a string of Catholic Stricklands—Sir Thomas' widow and her children. The Appleby family—as we have already seen—acquired Linton on Ouse and appeared there as recusants from 1633. Their legal knowledge no doubt enabled them to evade composition and conviction before 1637. In 1621 the Nendyke family of Dalby entered the presentments on the female side and remained there until at least 1637, compounding for a very modest sum in 1632. The Donnington family, strong recusants according to the presentments but apparently not compounders, appeared at Huby from 1629 and then moved to Huntington. Allen Ayscough and his family, originally from Middleton One Row in Co. Durham and resident in Ingleby Greenhow, came to live in Dalby in 1641. The charges against Strafford in 1641 for fixing some recusancy compositions

far too low included Allen, who was said to have an income of £600 a year and pay no more than £22 composition rent. In 1631 Hilary Beverley of Crambe appeared as a recusant and eventually conformed in 1638. There are two other cases of newcomers worth attention. Lord William Howard of Naworth finally gained control of his share of the Dacre inheritance in Yorkshire. His son, Sir William Howard, who was pretty certainly a Catholic, seems to have had the use of the Dacre manor of Brafferton at this period—yet he was never convicted in Yorkshire and the Brafferton presentments do no more than list repeatedly his Catholic servants there. A Mrs Jane Robertes, a determined recusant, with her son, Thomas Fairfax, appears in 1611–6 as harboured by the very respectably Protestant Sir Thomas Gower at Sheriff Hutton. In 1619 she was living with the Cholmleys at Brandsby and in 1632–7 at Brafferton. This lady had, long before, been the mistress of Gabriel Fairfax of Steeton in the West Riding, one of whose legitimate daughters was the wife of Sir Thomas Gower, while another was the wife of a brother of Lord Sheffield. Gabriel's two illegitimate sons by Mrs Robertes, Thomas and Matthew Fairfax, were wards of the Catholic Seth Holme of Huntington. Three grandsons of this Thomas Fairfax (later of Sledmire in the East Riding) were attorneys, two of them married to Catholics and all three legal advisers to Yorkshire Catholics of the 1660's. Gabriel Fairfax and Mrs Robertes had endured a great deal at the hands of the York ecclesiastical courts before his death in 1582 and their association was very ancient history.⁽²⁹⁾

The number of Catholics in Ryedale wapentake rose from the seventies of 1604 to about 100 in the 1620's and over 150 in 1642, when thirty-six lived in the parish of Hovingham. Of the eleven Catholic gentry families of 1604 four vanished by 1642. The seven survivors were headed by the Fairfaxes of Gilling. This family shared many of the characteristics of the Bellasises and Darcys; over the course of three generations it had been accumulating a landed income of over £2,750 a year, not by marrying heiresses but by the fruits of stewardships of Crown lands, exploitation of leases of titles and rectories, and enclosures round

Gilling. Catholicism had lurked in the background throughout this process, and strong efforts were several times made to ensure that heirs should be Protestants. Sir William Fairfax (d. 1597) ended his days, as we have seen, with going into opposition to the Council of the North, risking (and losing) his main stewardship of Crown lands, and marrying his only child and heir, Sir Thomas, to a strongly Catholic wife. So long as Lady Katherine lived (to 1626) Catholic influences were powerful and the elder four of their six sons all seem to have had a Catholic upbringing—three of them overseas. After her death things changed. In January 1627 Fairfax remarried to the widow of Sir William Bamburgh of Howsham, a strong Protestant. Henry Fairfax, his second son, left the Society of Jesus and apostatised, henceforward becoming his father's right-hand in their designs to keep the estate in Protestant hands in the future. The five daughters were all married to Protestants and rising men—two to Ingrams (one to Sir Arthur himself), one to Cuthbert Morley of Hawnby. In 1629 Sir Thomas joined his political fortunes to Wentworth's (both had been in opposition to the Buckingham régime) and was allowed to buy an Irish viscounty—which, however, by the terms of the patent, ranked before English barons. The acute difficulty which remained was the fact that his first, third and fourth sons remained Catholics. Thomas, the heir, returned from the Continent in 1624 and was compelled to spend the next twelve years as a Catholic vagrant to escape conviction for recusancy. He lived first in Mrs Dorothy Lawson's devout household at St Anthony's, Newcastle, then at Naworth Castle, where he married a grand-daughter of Lord William Howard, and finally on a remote property in Cumberland, Meaburn. In 1636 the first Viscount died, putting the entire estate into a trust (so that the Catholic heir would only be a life-tenant) and demanding—with financial penalties for refusal—that his eldest grandson should be taken away from his parents and brought up a Protestant. In 1637 the second Viscount and his wife were convicted of recusancy. He tried to have his composition fixed in London rather than by Wentworth, but failed and was rated at a rent of £251 a year, rising, as annuities fell in, to £306, on an

estate rated for fining purposes as worth not far short of £3,000 a year. In addition to this he lost the £1,200 penalty money, since he refused to have his son taken from him. The second Viscount died in 1641 leaving his heir a Crown ward. If Wentworth had still been alive and in power the chances of the family being able to buy the wardship in would have perhaps been even; as it was, the Long Parliament was in session and a strong anti-Catholic movement in operation. The Puritan Master of the Court of Wards, Lord Saye and Sele, brushed aside the influence of the Fairfaxes and Howards and nominated four Protestant guardians, headed by Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax of Denton. He acted with speed, fearing the child third Viscount would be spirited abroad, and had him carried off to Felsted School to be educated by its Puritan master, Martin Holbeach. Thus in 1642 the Gilling family was divided in religion and its future uncertain.

Next amongst the Ryedale survivor families were three of the four at Hovingham. Robert Holtby avoided conviction until 1611, but thenceforward his family was steadily all recusant. The heads and heirs of the Bullock family of South Holme remained conformist while women and younger sons were recusants. The Crathornes continued to use Ness as a dower house from Crathorne. The Wildon family remained recusant on the female side, certainly until 1624 and probably until they sold out in about 1635. At Helmsley the Catholic tendencies of the Crosland family went underground throughout this period. The family were all conformists except for two daughters who married Catholics and remained as recusants with their husbands in Helmsley down to 1642. In the Malton area all the three gentry families hitherto in part Catholic, the Raysins, Watsons and Butlers, lapsed or moved away long before 1642. At Muscoats, Kirkdale, the Bullock family's recusancy was submerged until 1611 but from then became strong.

There were five accessions to replace the losses. Lord Eure was quite the most colourful of these. We have already traced the beginnings of his recusancy in 1618. He was constantly in financial difficulties, which were in no way due to recusancy fines, since he was always sheltered from those by a royal pro-

tection. In 1609 the third Lord had already been in debt and sold Ingleby Greenhow. After 1622 the fourth Lord sold a mass of northern estates, Witton, Jarrow and Hexham. He became involved in furious lawsuits with the Arundells, and met the bailiffs with gunfire and forced the Council of the North to lay siege to his house at Malton. In spite of this and a bout of imprisonment in London for his disobedience, Malton in his day rapidly and artificially became a considerable Catholic centre, attracting a curious medley of vagrant Catholic gentry—Elizabeth Lady Ireland, William Ireland, Robert Goodrick, Elizabeth Yorke widow, William Garstang of Lancashire and his wife, Michael Earneley and his Crosland wife from Helmsley, William Parker, Marmaduke Thorpe, Stephen Willoughby. Eure's children were all Catholics and in 1642 it must have appeared quite possible that the family might weather its bankruptcy and flower permanently as a centre of Ryedale Catholicism. At Helmsley Francis Manners, seventh Earl of Rutland from 1612 to his death in 1632, put in occasional appearances. He was a convert to the Church before 1612 and married to a Catholic. Wentworth considered his influence in the Riding (or at least the influence his conviction and composition would have) so important that he set Hoby in 1631 to get the Earl convicted at Helmsley Quarter Sessions. The attempt failed, since the Earl was careful not to stay over four successive Sundays in Helmsley Castle. However the Rutland episode was over in 1632, since the Earl died and was succeeded in the estate and title by a Protestant. His widow retained a dower in Helmsley, occupied for her by John Crosland. The third newcomer family was the Worsleys of Hovingham. It was ironic that the Thomas Worsley who was to become a Catholic was the son of Robert Worsley, the keeper of the Salford Fleet prison and hunter of recusants. In 1619 Thomas Worsley, his wife, and daughter Elizabeth were presented as popish recusants at Quarter Sessions and indicted. Shortly afterwards a certificate was produced from the incumbent of Stonegrave that the three were not recusants but 'go orderly to church as some of the Bench know'. The Bench suspended conviction for further enquiries to be made by the next Session. In fact there is

no note in 1620-1 either of conviction or dismissal of the case. This was only the first odd detail of an involved story. In 1623, at the archbishop's visitation, the same three Worsleys were presented at Hovingham as recusants—but not at Quarter Sessions. As later records indicate, the family was most likely living part of its time in Hovingham and partly on Cheshire properties. In 1629 the record book of Wentworth's Recusancy Commissioners simply states that Thomas Worsley compounded, by Richard Heaton—the famous informer—at a rent of £40 a year. In fact the Worsleys had still not been convicted in Yorkshire and it is quite possible that they had not been convicted at all—Wentworth sometimes compounded the shy hurriedly, without waiting for the formalities of conviction. In 1631 Thomas Worsley conformed by attending service once in the Bishop of Chester's chapel. Heaton clearly—and rightly—did not believe this to be final; in fact Worsley was convicted at the Middlesex Quarter Sessions in 1632. From then to 1642 he, his wife and daughter appeared as compounders. At Sproxton, Helmsley, the wife of Peter Swales, gent., was a recusant from 1629 to 1642. Finally, at Stonegrave the Thornton family at this period continued its earlier marginal Catholicism. William Thornton married a Catholic recusant, the widow of Robert Yoward of Westerdale. He himself was never presented. Their children were Protestants, but his heir, Robert Thornton, married a Catholic Metham, also a convicted recusant until her death in 1619. In about 1622 Robert remarried—to an ultra-Protestant Darley of Buttercrambe. His three daughters by his first marriage were Catholics and married to prominent recusants. His children by his second marriage were almost Presbyterians. He himself never appeared in presentments.⁽³⁰⁾

This survey should suffice to give substance to the Catholic statistics of the period. It reveals the glaring weaknesses of the Catholic body in the Riding. Part-Catholic, part-Protestant families, conformism, occasional conformity were extremely common; of some 200 gentry families affected by Catholicism we can count thirty-three as alone being in the main Catholic. Catholics were a very small minority indeed—nothing like the

mass movements of Dissent from the 1640's or Methodism in the eighteenth century in these same areas. In the Catholic body quite small landowners or leaseholders, their households, servants and immediate tenants much predominated over other classes and types—Catholicism was linked intimately with their fortunes. On the other hand there were signs of strength—the extraordinary and equally-spread influence on the gentry; the ability to attract and hold people as diverse as Cleveland jetters, fishermen, tailors, ambitious new peers, declining old ones, small gentry, farmers; the extraordinary tenacity of the attraction of Catholicism for the most marginal; the facing of relatively heavy levies, ostracism, discomfort, insecurity by so many; the extraordinarily high proportion of vocations by any ordinary standards.

Jacobean and Caroline Catholic laity in the Riding have left us few indications of their outlook. An occasional voice can be heard. On 8 October 1607 John Hutchinson, yeoman, of Middleton Tyas was reported to have said 'the Kinges Maiestie hath no lawes whereby to graunt commission to take Recusantes goodes; neither can make lawes soe to doe; but they (meaning the officers) may as well stand at a lanes end and take a purse: And further he said that Seminary priestes were messengers sent from God'. Thomas Meynell's commonplace book reflects at least some of his mind—'Md. (god be thanked and owr blissid Lady) God Almightye haith the blissid my Sonne, and inriched me with Five sonnes wthin the compas of Five yeares'.—'My uncle Richard Meynell, who was an honest, wise and valiente gentleman. He followed the example of his uncle Henry . . . he died unmarried, and did not onely much advance this howse of Northkilvington, but also principally did raise my brother George Meynell his howse of Dalton Ryall. wee may truly say the Chastitie of twoo worthie gentlemen did in gods providence very much Increase our estates: so that we are bownd in all honestie, and Conscience, faithfully to praye for their soules. They both died Chatholikes: and I pray my posteritie to pray for them.'—'The happie and exquisite end of my most lovinge wife, maketh me very Confidente (allmightie god assistinge me wth his holly

grace: and our blessed ladie Favoyringe me wth hir blessed
 prairs) to meete hir againe in heaven: and there eternally to
 praise and glorifie our Creator'.—'As it pleased god in all ages
 to whose blessed name all honour and glory ever be and I poore
 wretch humbly beseech his blessed mother to thanke his maiestie
 in my behalfe to upholde our name, Familie and Armorye: so
 he always furnished wth meanes to maintaine our Gentry . . .'.
 —'my worthie mother brought both landes and worships to
 this howse: from whom I derived and had . . . five worthie
 Cote armours . . . for whose soule therefore all my posteritie
 is strictly bounde to praye, died a Catholike . . .'.—Md. 1621.
 We wonn hitherto to Kilvington from Gaterley the Gould bell.
 from Hambleton the Silver bell. from Bagby more a Silver cupp
 for ever. Viscount Dunbarr, wth a horse from Upsall did winn
 from Hambleton the gould bell from the Forest of Gautres two
 bells from Studfawde a Silver cupp for ever. another from Harrow
 of the Hays . . . allsoe my cosin William Greene did winn
 Rainton Cupp . . .'.—Anno domini 1623. Mense Aprilis ther
 was seaven horses which did rune at Richemond for a Bowle
 worth 12 li . . . and a salte worth six, the first horse to have the
 best, second, the next, Sir William Gascoigne did win the first, I
 myselfe did win the second with a nagge called Frontino of coler
 white. My son Richard did win the same weeke the best cupp att
 Thirske with a white nagge full brother to the other. Md. 1601.
 1624 my sonn Richard and I did winn bothe the coppes att Thirsk
 upon Wednesday in Easter weeke.'—(jotted on the top of a
 schedule of deeds) 'Jhesus Maria / ego Thomas Meynell cognita
 et certa quae inspexi scribo / blesse; when you are cursed /
 beseeche, when you are blasphemed / Rewarde reproaches, with
 patience / and hatred with love. Divinum auxilium meaneat
 semper cum Menelais de Kilvington illosque cum prole pia
 benedicat virgo Maria. et fidelium animae per misericordiam dei
 requiescant in pace. Amen. february 1601.'—(written on the
 back of his composition lease with Sir John Savile in 1627)
 'Memorand. After the expiration of two leases for my Recusancie
 videlicet / off 40 two yeares this is the first payment Towards
 a thirde lease. Sancta Michael ora pro me. 1627.'

There are the papers of a suit for breach of promise (most likely in the York Chancery court). George Nendyke of Dalby, a Catholic recusant, was engaged to marry Margery Withes, a Protestant, but broke off the engagement because her parents would only consent if George would go to church and become a Protestant. The affair brought together at George's father's house at Dalby Mr Jordan Metham of Wigganthorpe and Mr Marmaduke Holtby of Hovingham (both Catholics, and Holtby George's uncle), who were negotiating on George's behalf, and Margery's Protestant relatives. Not surprisingly, conversation turned to the Gunpowder Plot (though the meeting took place in 1629) and grew heated. Mrs Headlam of York, a Protestant, cried out on 'the vileness of the faite and the cruell massacre wch was like to have fallen thereby by meanes of the papistes'. Oddly enough, she did not later think anything said by the Nendykes or Holtby worthy of remark, but concentrated on her argument with one Robert Otterburne, a tenant of Holtby's from Hovingham. She thought he was a papist and tried hard to read popery into his remarks. Yet another deponent, a native of Hovingham, insisted that Otterburne was a Protestant and he certainly does not occur in Hovingham presentments. He began by denying that papists had taken part in the Plot. Mrs Headlam furiously contradicted him. Now in a passion, he said: 'If it were yet wee do not falsify our oathes, for a Catholike needes not to keepe faithe wth an hereticke . . . whatsoever a Catholicke sweareth against an hereticke he doth not forswear him selfe . . . (but) they must keep faithe amongst 'themselves.'⁽³¹⁾

There are two interesting features of Catholic life at this period which should be mentioned—Catholic actors and teachers. In Elizabeth's reign several Statutes against sturdy beggars and vagrants had included clauses instructing local authorities to whip and brand as beggars players of interludes—at first only if they had no licence from a nobleman, and later even if they produced such a licence. The government was suspicious of local actors as liable to introduce political or religious comment into their plays, in the form of prologues, interludes (*entr'actes*) or 'jigs' (end-pieces of verse sung to popular tunes, highly

topical and scurrilous. It was also hostile to rustic medieval plays and mimes performed in churches or churchyards, as disorderly and generally popish in tone and meaning. Visitation presentments occasionally mention 'rush-bearing' plays and games in churchyards—at Brandsby, Aldborough, Ripley, Stanwick. Thus in about 1608 the papists of Ripley habitually piped and danced in the churchyard during Evensong on Sundays. At Stanwick that year they got into the church on Saturday night and left in the pulpit a wooden dummy of the parson in surplice. At Brandsby in 1615 the play of Robin Hood was performed in the churchyard and church, with local recusants taking the parts of Robin and the sheriff. In 1595 we first hear of the Egton Interlude players, when Robert Simpson, cordwainer of Egton and Christopher Cordiner (?Simpson) of the same, both recusants, were said to be common players of interludes up and down the countryside. By 1603 'jigs' were certainly current in the Cleveland-Allertonshire district—we suspect rather anticlerical ones. In 1609 Robert and Christopher Simpson were well-enough established to be invited to take their company of actors across to Gowlthwaite Hall in Nidderdale, to play to an audience of a hundred, headed by Sir John Yorke, a Catholic. The players offered Yorke a choice—of Shakespeare's *King Lear* or *Pericles* (then only recently out), *The Three Shirleys* or *St Christopher*. *St Christopher* was chosen and played. The play must have been a version of an old morality. The hero, one Reprobus, a man without any definite religion, wanted to serve the greatest person on earth. He passed from the service of the Emperor to the devil, since he discovered that the Emperor feared the devil. Then he found that the devil feared the crucifix, and submitted to it, was instructed by a holy hermit, did penance and received a new name, Christopher. The players added an interlude or *entr'acte*, a playlet designed to apply the moral to their own day. This was a burlesque-serious dialogue between a Catholic priest, holding a crucifix, and a Protestant minister, holding a Bible; the priest prevailed, and the interlude ended with the minister being carried off-stage by devils—one of whom was Christopher Yorke, later to be a Carthusian. The players were not caught. By 1610

Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby was on their track. He accused Sir Richard Cholmley of allowing them to play at Sneaton, actually heading the audience, with his father, at Roxby, and giving the players a licence. Hoby showered the area with warrants, threatening to arrest the players the moment they broke the Statutes by playing outside Egton. But he admitted that the gentry and even Justices protected them so that they had a free run of the country with their 'popishe playes'. In 1612 the Bench noted that they had played recently at Stokesley and Marton and recorded their names—Christopher Simpson, cordwainer, of Egton as leader, Robert Simpson, cordwainer, of Staithes, and five others, from Hutton Bushel, Allerston (a weaver), Moresholm, Danby and Bowlby (a mason). By 1616 Robert Simpson headed the company, with John, Richard and Cuthbert Simpson of Egton, George White, weaver, of Egton, Edward Concett, tailor, of Egton, Nicholas Poskett, labourer of Egton (a boy then, and later a priest-martyr) and a labourer from Goathland. That year they had played in nine houses of gentry and yeomen—of Catholics at Marske (Ralph Rokeby), Marton (John Wildon), Stainsby (John Gower), Appleton Wiske (Richard Lodge) and of others at Wilton, Croft, in Richmondshire (William Chaytor, Esq.), Smeaton, Hawnby, and Lealholm. The Bench did no more than fine them heavily. The same year Richard Cholmley of Brandsby was fined for harbouring a sister company from Hutton Bushel and Wilton, which went on to play at Egton in the house of Francis Tomlin. After this the Sessions records are long silent about the companies and perhaps they were broken up. When all allowances are made for the contemporary background of pipers and village plays and wits, this Cleveland phenomenon remains mysterious. Hutton Bushel, Allerston and Moresholm were not recusant centres. The players were—with the exception of Poskett—hardly educated men. We are bound to suspect that they had been coached by priests—who had been brought up to the performance of plays at Douai. The tradition was not quite lost. In 1655 a company from Sowerby played 'a comedy or staige playe' at Christmas in Gilling Castle, at Oulston and at Brandsby Hall and there are

later faint references to interludes in the Quarter Sessions records.⁽³²⁾

In spite of recent researches into Catholic education at this period and claims made for it, we find the evidence scanty and puzzling. It is obvious that, whatever happened to the school system in the mid-sixteenth century, schools proliferated in the countryside thereafter. The archiepiscopal surveys of schoolmasters in 1562-4 and the 1570's and repeated presentments from then onwards reveal the presence of official schoolteachers in most villages of any size and a large number of 'private schools' and free-lance unlicenced teachers. Any Catholic scholastic efforts were therefore made on a background of a considerable demand for education and of a large number of (no doubt often short-lived) official and clandestine Protestant schools. The Protestant gentry seem normally to have relied on several methods for educating their children—starting with home education in letters by a relation or servant, catechising by the parson or by a house chaplain (then easier to obtain since curates were quite often so poor that they could readily be persuaded to live in with the squire), sending boys to the households of wealthier relations, to village and grammar schools, to the University (often still at the age of fourteen), the Inns of Court and then on a foreign tour. This was common form. We even get an impression from the visitation books that the ecclesiastical authorities were always so deluged by unlicenced teachers that their efforts to exclude the unlicenced and unexamined were very fitful and inefficient. We can readily imagine, therefore, that the Catholic gentry's education problems were much eased by all this; they had only to follow the social current of the times. So much for imagination—but proof is a much more difficult matter. In the first place, there is astonishingly little evidence of house-tutors in Catholic gentry houses throughout Yorkshire. A much-quoted special survey of Yorkshire recusancy of 1604 appears, at first sight, to mention four such Catholic teachers in the North Riding. Two genuine cases, at the Talbots' house at Thornton-le-Street and the Cholmleys' at Whitby, had appeared between 1590 and 1596—and the tutors had now vanished. But

of the four of 1604, only one was really a house-tutor—living with Marmaduke Tunstall of Barningham and teaching his children. At Egton the teacher was a retired farmer, living in the house of his daughter, a farmer's wife, and he was clearly a 'parish catechist'. At Huntington the teacher was a married housewife and only recently a recusant, with no particular connection with the Holme family. At Hutton Bonville the teacher was pretty clearly an official parochial one, appointed by a Protestant. He had not communicated the previous Easter—a common fault, which he did not repeat. After 1604 there are two sources on house-tutors—the *responsa*, or autobiographies, of students entering colleges abroad, and visitation records. The *responsa* of youths who claimed to have been brought up as Catholics are scanty and almost always extremely vague in their accounts of their education. Much of the vagueness stems from the fact that they were writing in Latin, and in a very formalised Latin. Thus 'educatus' or 'imbutus' could mean 'instructed', 'prepared for the Sacraments', 'given the rudiments of a classical education or mere letters in a traditional doctrinal setting' (viz. learning one's letters and even elementary Latin from a Primer or Canisius' Catechism); 'domi' might mean in his father's house or at a neighbouring school. Thus John Layton of Gatherley Race, the son of Catholic vagrants, merely says that he was brought up at Gatherley and in three other counties. Andrew Stonehouse of Dunsley, Whitby, the son of a poor farmer or jetter, was brought up for seven years at home and required four more at St Omer to produce his halting Latinity. John Foster was brought up 'at home' at Earswick; but his elder brother, Seth, had already explained that during their childhood their parents brought them up as Protestants. Christopher Sampson of Upsall, a poor farmer's son, vaguely (and surprisingly) says that he was educated at a number of 'town schools' with intermissions between them. Thomas Jenison of Egton, another farmer's son, was even vaguer—he had had 'a varied education'. John Metcalfe of North Otterington—quoted as a proof that even modest gentry like his parents could afford a house-tutor—merely says that he was educated 'in the country' by 'good teachers'. William

Metham of Wigganthurpe—quoted as being carefully educated by his father's Jesuit chaplain—actually says no more than that he was instructed in right principles by Jesuits. John Robinson of Upsall is more explicit and says he was imbued with rudiments (of Latinity or religious instruction?) by Jesuit fathers and those others whom they 'wished' ('Ignatians' perhaps). Later in the account, he admits that he did attend a Protestant school for some months. He went to Ghent and St Omer at the age of ten to endure seven years of schooling. In the York court books we find only five possible references to Catholic house-tutors. In 1627 Thomas Wood, a recusant, was teaching children without licence at Leake. He was accounted a yeoman member of a local family. At that time there was a drive against recusants harboured in gentry houses, but Wood is not said to be maintained by any of the three Catholic gentry families in his parish. No later presentment mentions him as teaching. He would seem to have been a parish catechist. In 1632-3 Emmanuel Dawson of Lanmoth, in the same parish, was twice presented as a popish recusant 'teaching a school' without licence. He may well have been employed by the Greene family of Lanmoth but was apparently not living in their house. In 1615 Thomas Simpson, a recusant, was teaching children at Marske in Cleveland—possibly for the Rokeby family. In 1640 John Husthwaite, a recusant, was teaching a school at Stokesley—possibly supported by the Fosters. In 1614 Edward Nickson, 'ludimagister', was presented as a popish recusant at Egton. His name occurs just before those of the Smith family of Egton Bridge. His title implies that he was the ordinary parish schoolmaster, however.⁽³³⁾

There is evidence that the practice of the gentry sending their children to relations existed amongst the Catholic gentry. The *responsa* note this quite regularly. Visitation lists frequently show the households of wealthier Catholics studded with the familiar surnames of other Catholic gentry. George Thwing was a 'servant' at Osgoodby; Mary Ward was brought up in no less than four such households in succession. The convent archives, as we have seen, contain some material on this and on the way it extended to farmers' daughters sent into 'service'. There is not

much evidence of Catholic boys going to Protestant village or grammar schools, though, as we have seen, six out of every seven 'Catholic' gentry families were still mixed in religious composition. William Wolfe—admittedly brought up a Protestant—went to the Darleys' grammar school at Scarborough. William Percehay of Ryton, the son of a schismatic, was sent to York Grammar School before entering the English College, Rome. Robert Holtby went to Oswaldkirk school. Ninian Girlington of Wycliffe, a recusant, sent his son William to the town school at Aldborough, Boroughbridge and then to Caius College, Cambridge, and Lincoln's Inn. Francis Scrope of Danby was sent to the ordinary schools at Thornton Steward and Pocklington before entering the Puritan Sidney Sussex College at Cambridge—and emerging to be convicted as a recusant. George Tocketts of Guisborough, a conformist then, but soon afterwards a determined recusant, sent his son Robert to St John's College, Cambridge in 1602, and on to Gray's Inn in 1608. Henry Constable of Burton Constable, a Catholic, seems to have attended the fashionable school run by the Rev. Anthony Higgin (later Dean of Ripon) at Well in Richmondshire—and to have presented Higgin with a Catholic book. Nevertheless, as far as our scanty evidence goes, it does seem that even Church-papist parents were showing a much increased hesitation about sending their sons to Protestant schools and universities. The rise of the boys' schools at Douai (the English College and St Gregory's) and the Jesuit school at St Omer (academically probably a good deal better than any schooling obtainable in England by Yorkshire gentry of moderate means) led to a steady increase in the habit of sending boys overseas as young as ten and eleven. The great flow of the sons of pro-Catholic Yorkshire gentry to the Universities between 1560 and 1580 thereafter dwindled steeply and even very marginal families like the Bellasises and Fairfaxes sent very few sons there after 1600. Resort to the Inns of Court—bypassing the University—lasted much longer, particularly amongst families with a traditional connection with the legal profession. Sir Robert Dolman of Gunby, a devout Catholic lawyer, still had chambers in Gray's Inn at his death in 1628. As we have seen, two

Applebys of Linton were expelled from the same Inn in 1638 for non-communicating. Solomon Swale of Grinton (a recusant in 1641) entered the Inn in 1630 and sent his eldest son there in 1648.⁽³⁴⁾

Thus it seems likely that a number of factors combined to make the Catholic schools abroad a necessity—the increased official pressure against harbouring of recusants (together with presentment of children over the age of nine) from 1620 made house-tutors a difficulty and discouraged the assembly of young people in other households; most likely material for tutors grew increasingly hard to find (ordinands sometimes served as tutors for a few years in the 1590's, but now tended to go abroad much younger); Catholic opinion set more and more uniformly against resort to Protestant schools. However there always remained another possibility—Catholic private schools in England. These might range from home teaching by parents and nurses, to a congregation's catechist and to private day or boarding schools. The first kind obviously existed very widely, though it has—not unnaturally—left no trace, even in Thomas Meynell's commonplace book. The second had as its concomitant the withdrawal of children from catechism classes at the Anglican church. Oddly enough this charge only occurs fitfully in the visitation books; the prevalence of pluralism and absenteeism amongst the clergy and of very large parishes must have made a rigid enforcement of the Injunctions in this matter often impossible. The evidence for congregational catechists is slim. We have already cited possible cases at Egton, Stokesley, Huntington, Leake. At Masham between 1619 and 1633 there were four presentments of unlicensed teachers of children. One, John Sanderson of Healey, was a recusant and probably at work around 1627–33. At Bedale in 1623 a housewife, Jane wife of Marmaduke Grange, a recusant, was 'teaching a private school'. At Eppleby, Forcett, in 1630–3 Thomas Hildreth—perhaps the village schoolmaster or master of his own private school—a recusant, was 'teaching school without licence'. The same year Robert Smithson 'ludimagister' and recusant was doing the same at Kirkby Ravensworth. As for evidence of anything still more ambitious—we have already noted

the presence of Mary Ward and her religious (devoted to teaching and catechising) at Hutton Rudby and Heworth Hall in 1642-4. On entering the English College, Rome, in 1612, George Holtby of Hovingham said that he was brought up anyhow until the age of thirteen to fourteen when his uncle, Fr Richard Holtby, converted his family and found a place for the boy in the house of a daughter of the Earl of Westmoreland (possibly near Newcastle, under the uncle's eye). Clearly this arrangement was either dangerous or, more likely, gave little opportunity for preparatory schooling, so his patroness sent the boy to the school of 'a well-known' master at Knaresborough for six months, before he went on to St Omer. There had been mention of such a school at Knaresborough in the 1590's, but we have no knowledge of the master (or masters). Then there is the case of Roger Conyers, the master of a flourishing school at Helmsley in 1625—he had an usher. He was then accused of receiving the children of popish recusants, who did not go to church—but not of recusancy himself. He answered, in effect, that it was true he received recusants' children, but that they went to church in the places they came from (perhaps an indication that it was a day school) and he supplied a list of their names and addresses on demand without demur. In 1629 he was inhibited from teaching any more in the diocese of York, though his usher was allowed to carry on the school. We can only suppose that he was a Protestant running a profitable private school (there is no evidence that he was master of any established grammar school) and willing to let Catholic children absent themselves from his catechism classes. He was clearly meeting a Catholic demand. Then there is the case of William Tankard (who cannot be fitted into extant Tankard of Brampton and Whixley pedigrees), a married man and convicted recusant. He was presented in 1632 as 'teaching school' at Thirkelby and also at Felixkirk. The following year he was to be 'teaching school without licence to the hindrance of the curate' at Felixkirk, and in 1637 was doing the same at Sowerby. Finally there was Francis Gotherick, a mysterious figure. In 1604 a man of that name, living at Kirkby Ravensworth, and perhaps the recusant married tailor of that same name

presented then at Kirkby, was reported to be 'lately from beyond seas' and resorting to Marmaduke Tunstall's house at Barningham. In 1624 the High Commissioners proceeded against a Francis Gotherick, tailor, of Kirkby Hill for harbouring a priest and a schoolmaster, who ran a private school for papist children in his house. Gotherick answered spiritedly that the master was not a recusant and that he had legal advice that such a school was therefore right. Oddly enough, the Commissioners do not seem to have pursued the school charge and contented themselves with making Gotherick undergo conferences. He remained a recusant with his wife in Kirkby Ravensworth until his death in about 1638, and we hear no more of his school.

There survive two letters from a Catholic schoolboy, John Meynell of Kilvington, Thomas Meynell's grandson. In October 1637—when he was just over twelve years of age—he wrote to his father at Kilvington to announce his safe arrival at Douai with his younger brother William, who was only ten years old. John was to leave the college to return home on 25 July 1642—a significant date—'*studio visendi suos*'. He does not explain who conveyed them. They landed near Nieuport, and found war raging in Flanders. After seeing their Poor Clare aunt at Grave-lines, they narrowly escaped a French army near Watten and reached Douai with the help of an Irish College student. The following February he explained that 'I with my brother weare extraordinarie glad att the receipt of your letters. . . .' He adds: 'My brother is in grammar and for his excellencie in that Schoole hath gotten the first premium. I was thought to have studied a yeare more therfore described to the Sintaxian Classe.' But where had they been at school previously? Their parents had spent most of the years of the boys' childhood dodging pursuivants. It is possible that their sons stayed at Marston in the Ainsty, their mother's home, where a Catholic schoolmaster was certainly being kept in 1620.⁽³⁵⁾

Notes

- (1) Aveling, *Catholic Recusants of the W. Riding*, p. 301 (Sheffield); Meynell MSS (Ampleforth), i, f.20.
- (2) HMC, Salisbury, xvi, p. 44; Newburgh Priory, Wombwell MSS, 1609, Sheffield to Fairfax.
- (3) NRRO, Minutes and Orders Bks., *passim*; VCHNR. Eure—J. C. Clay, *Extinct and Dormant Peerages of the North*; J. Foster, *cit.*; CCC, 224off.
- (4) M. Howard, *cit.*; Meads, *cit.*; PRO, Star Chamber, 8/12/11; 104/5; 175/4; 18/1; 19/10; 184/33.
- (5) HMC, *cit.*, xviii, pp. 21–2, 38; Archbishop Mathew's Diary (York Minster Lib.). Rowntree—BI, Chancery Bk., 1613–8, f.41v.; PRO, SP. 14/88.
- (6) Thornborough—DNB; *The Rambler*, 1857, pp. 348ff.; Rymer, *Foedera*, vii, 2, p. 81; CSPD, Add. 1580–1625, p. 392; 1603–10, p. 237. Swinburne—DNB; CRS, 55/430. Sherborne—G. E. Aylmer, *The King's Servants*, 1961, pp. 79ff.
- (7) Cliffe, *op. cit.*; CSPD, 1611–8, pp. 459ff.; APC, *passim* (Wharton). Sheffield—PRO, SP. 14/104. Heaton—CRS 53/279ff.; PRO, Star Chamber, 8/11/12.
- (8) SS, 124 (Hoby). NRRO, Minutes and Orders Bks.; BI, H.C., 1607–12, f.25, where the Oath of Allegiance is called an 'Oath of royal Supremacy', and taking it 'conforming'.
- (9) CRS, 53; YASRS, 54/397; RH, 4, v, p. 194. Reports by N.E. Assize Judges—PRO, SP. 12/155 (1582); 12/235 (1590's?); 14/16, 14/188 (c.1615).
- (10) CRS, 56 (Meynell); Eure—CSPD, 1623–5, p. 299; 1625–6, p. 134; 1639–40, p. 215. Baltimore—*ibid.*; J. C. Jeaffreson, *Middlesex Cty Records*, iii/140. Metcalfe—Metcalfe Records, *cit.*; CSPD, 1631–3, p. 341. B. Magee, *English Recusants*, pp. 65ff. (Spiller).
- (11) M. J. Havran, *Catholics in Caroline England*, 1962, pp. 18ff.; CSPD, *passim*; CRS, 53/291ff.; J. Bramhall, *Collected Works*, iii/540; J. Rushworth, *Hist. Collections*, 1682, i/391.
- (12) CRS, 53 (Strafford); H. E. Bell, *Introduction to the History of the Court of Wards*, pp. 122ff.; Surtees, *History of Durham*, iii/245 (Morton); J. Fisher, *cit.*, pp. 103ff. (Danby); RH, 4, ii/61ff.
- (13) Lockwood—Bodleian Bankes MSS, 17/49; CSPD, 1637/8, p. 147. Informers—NRRO, Minutes and Orders Bks.; CRS, 53/291ff.; Havran, *cit.*, pp. 120ff.

- (14) *NRRO*, cit.; E. Stephens, *Clerks of the Counties*, 1961, pp. 186ff.
- (15) *CRS*, 53, cit.
- (16) Foley; P. Hughes, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England*, pp. 409ff.; *CRS*, 54-5; Stonyhurst Anglia MSS, iv, No. 51 (Walker).
- (17) Allanson MSS, Ampleforth; *CRS*, 33, *passim*; N. Prov. Record Bk. (Downside).
- (18) Old Brotherhood MSS, cit., i/25-6 (More); W. Brady, *Episc. Succession*, 3/90 (Panzani); Havran, cit., p. 80 (Jones); Tierney, cit., 5/7-8 (Birkhead). Lascelles—J. Foster, cit., p. 61; *CRS*, 10; *BI*, Chancery Bk., 1635-8, f.292v.; *Complete Peerage*, cit. (Lumley).
- (19) Tierney, cit., 5; *BI*, R. VII. H/1612 (Bulmer).
- (20) *DD*; Hughes, cit., pp. 312ff., 409ff.; Stonyhurst Anglia MSS, 4/51 (York Castle); Bramhall, cit.; Brady, cit., 3/96ff.; Tierney, cit. 5 (espec. ixff. of Appendix).
- (21) Stonyhurst Anglia MSS, 6/53 (vows); printed and MS convent records too numerous to be listed here.
- (22) Scrope—*ARP*, RD/AC, i, 5, f.33; *Complete Peerage*, cit.
- (23) Main sources for this section: *BI*, H.C. and Visitn. Bks.; *NRRO*, Q.S. Bk. of Recusants, 1630; *CRS*, 53; *PRO*, Star Chamber, 8/24/i (Pudsey); J. Gillow, *Lisbon College*, p. 185 (Calvert).
- (24) Scrope—Scrope MSS, Danby Hall; *BI*, Chancery Bk., 1623-6, ff. 460ff.; Camden Soc., N.S. 39/51-7.
- (25) Lawson—Cliffe, cit.; Lawson MSS, cit. Danby—J. Fisher, cit., Thoresby Soc., vol. 37/1-29; Cunliffe-Lister MSS, Cartwright Hall, Bradford, B.73-7. Calvert—*NRRO*, Turner MSS (Kiplin deed).
- (26) *STA*, Box 6.B/1, General Letters; Box 16.E/19, Quarter Sessions.
- (27) Wombwell MSS, cit.
- (28) *SS*, 172; Notes and Queries, N.S. XII., 7 Dec. 1861 (1614); *BI*, H.C., 1612-25, ff.31ff.; Bar Convent, York, Wigmore MSS.
- (29) *MT*, ii/443ff. (Cholmley); *NRRO*, Hutton MSS (Pipe Roll Bk.); Hornyhold-Strickland, *Geneal. Memoirs of Family of Strickland*, 1928; *RH*, 3, iff. (Fairfaxes).
- (30) *Ibid.*; *Complete Peerage*, cit. (Eure); *CRS*, 53/380; *HMC*, Rutland MSS (Rutland); Worsley—Cliffe, cit.; *CRS*, 53/315, 346.
- (31) *CRS*, 56/ixff. (Meynell); *BI*, R. VII. H/1827 (Nendyke).
- (32) *BI*, R. VI. A/18 (Brandsby); *CRS*, 53/32-3; *PRO*, Star Chamber, 8/276/26; M. Howard, cit.; Sisson, cit., pp. 129ff.; Star Chamber, 8/12/11; *NRRO*, Minutes and Orders Bks.
- (33) *CRS*, 54-5; A. C. F. Beales, *Education under Penalty*, p. 205;

BI, R. VI. A/21 (Wood); B/4 and *NRRO*, Minutes and Orders Bks. (Dawson); R. VI. A/18 (Simpson); C/4 (Husthwaite).

(34) Venn, *Alumni Cantab.*; *Procs. of Leeds Philos. and Lit. Soc.*, Hist. Section, X, pt. i (1962), p. 5 (Well school).

(35) J. Fisher, cit. (Masham); *BI*, R. VI. A/23 (Bedale); A/22-3 (Forcett); *NRRO*, Minutes and Orders Bks., cit. (Kirkby); *CRS*, 37/166 (Holtby). Conyers—H.C., 1612-25, ff.362ff.; 1626-31, f.252. Tankard—R. VI. C/26; B/4; A/24. Gotherick—Peacock, *Catholics in Yorkshire*, 1604, pp. 85-6; *BI*, R. VII. H/1598; *PRO*, SP. 15/13; *NRRO*, cit. Meynell—*CRS*, 56.

The Recusants of the Later Seventeenth Century, 1642-1702

THE HISTORY of governmental action against Catholic recusants during these sixty years is an extraordinary tale of ups and downs. As we have seen, the main legal machinery of repression collapsed in May-July 1642. For the next three years the county was a battleground, subject to much martial and administrative law. It seems important to assess exactly how much fighting took place in the Riding, if we are to judge the complaints and reactions of Catholics properly. Of course, the well-known battles took place in the East and West Ridings. But the North Riding also had a real share of military operations. At the start of the war there was a period of doubt and effort at a county truce; then the Parliamentarians gained the upper hand outside York. They raised troops from Richmondshire and Cleveland. In November 1642, threatened by an invasion from Newcastle by the Royalist forces of the Earl of Newcastle, Hotham's army marched north through the Riding, by Topcliffe and Yarm to Northallerton, was defeated at Piercebridge on the Tees and retreated. Newcastle moved down to York. In January and February 1643 Sir Hugh Cholmley of Whitby, the Parliamentary commander of Scarborough Castle garrison, made a determined sally. He aimed at Newcastle's line of communications, surprised a royalist garrison in Malton, another in Guisborough, and reached Yarm Bridge, only to be beaten there and to retreat to Scarborough. In March he declared for the King and handed over the Castle. Most of the country now remained relatively peaceful for a year. But a Parliamentary offensive was opened early in

1644, when Sir William Constable sallied out of Hull up into Cleveland, took Whitby, went through Pickering and surprised a royalist force at Coldham before returning to Hull. Then the Scots army advanced on York through Northallerton and Wetherby. The Army of the Eastern Association came north and joined the rest in the first siege of York, itself holding the North Riding side of the siege lines. It was possibly now that an action was fought at Sheriff Hutton. There followed Marston Moor on 1 July 1644 and the collapse of the royalist hold on the county. Newcastle fled abroad through Scarborough. There followed a war of sieges. The Scots lingered round Thirsk and Northallerton before moving back to the north. In August 1644 the sieges of Scarborough and Helmsley Castles began. Helmsley surrendered on 22 November and Scarborough not until July 1645. The last garrison of the royalists in the Riding, Bolton Castle, surrendered on 5 November 1645.

Throughout this fighting, the whole Riding endured heavy levies of men, money, forced billeting, requisitioning of crops, beasts and transport by both sides. It had all begun in 1638 with the Bishops' Wars; it did not end in November 1645. The billeting accounts of the Catholic Salvin family in Croxdale, Co. Durham, give a vivid impression of the wear and tear caused to a family—as do the papers of Thomas Meynell of Kilvington, who had the misfortune to be near the main north road and so feel the full impact of passing troops. The period of royalist rule in the county—under a County Committee—meant the seizure of the goods and rents of all suspected Parliamentarians, the levy of extra money and bonds from papists, especially neutral ones. It is likely that Petty and Liberty Sessions continued throughout the war—they certainly did so in Scarborough, but Quarter Sessions only met once, in October 1643. A Bench totally reconstituted of Parliamentarians began to sit again regularly from April 1645—meeting then in the garrison town of Malton. A Parliamentary Committee of the City and County of York seems to have begun sessions in July 1645—at least its one surviving minute book starts then. The Long Parliament had protested in 1641 against the whole pre-war system of composi-

tions and immunities, demanding a rigorous execution of the penal and fining laws to the letter. In March and August 1643 the Parliament issued ordinances and instructions to County Committees to regulate fining practice in occupied areas. The basic principles of these 'sequestrations' were that all 'delinquents' (those who had helped the King in arms or even with goods and money) were to lose all their goods and real estate, while Papists who were not delinquents were to suffer full seizure according to the Statutes, without remissions, compositions or leases back to them. The instructions defined a Papist as a convicted popish recusant, or one who had been to Mass since August 1642, or who had kept one brought up a Papist in his house, or who refused to take the Oath of Abjuration—a complete denial of the Catholic Faith very explicitly. In addition to this the principle of doubling taxes for Papists and non-communicants was retained—at a time when taxes were extremely high. The ordinances allowed one fifth of the yield of the seized estate of a delinquent to be paid annually to support his wife and children—but if it was a papist family, the children must be brought up as Protestants or severe deductions would be made from the fifth. The Court of Wards was now to be used rigorously to the same end. It is true that, long before the end of the first war, Parliament offered terms to delinquents—but not papist delinquents—that if they submitted and took the Solemn League and Covenant and an oath of obedience they might be allowed to compound with a lump sum payment and recover their estates.⁽¹⁾

The direction of this policy, even in details, was reserved to the Westminster Committee for Sequestrations (later the Committee for Compounding), but the local execution depended on an elaborate hierarchy of committees. The system was only put into operation in Yorkshire after it was 'liberated', in 1645. A County Committee had a sub-committee for Sequestrations; the North Riding acquired its own Standing Committee, with its sequestration committee. Under the latter were sequestrators for each area (for instance Allertonshire) and collectors. Beside these was the Bench, operating much as it had done before 1642.

The personnel which filled these offices was necessarily limited, and contained at least a half of 'new men'—small gentry or 'mere', courtesy gentry unknown to the heralds, who were nearly all keen Parliamentarians. The rest belonged to the Parliamentary minority of the proper gentry class, accustomed to executive office in the county as of their birthright—though a few of this class now taken into service were more political neutrals than Parliamentarians (for instance Christopher Percehay of Ryton). Considering the degree to which Catholicism had penetrated the tightly interrelated ranks of both of these classes, it is not very surprising that local officialdom contained numbers of men with quite close Catholic connections. Thus Ralph Rymer of Yafforth and Brafferton is a case in point. He was almost the best-known Parliamentary hack in the north, secretary of the North Riding Standing and Sequestration Committees, North Riding Justice. It was calculated that in non-revolutionary days he would have risen no higher than Head Constable. His father came from Northallerton and had a leasehold property in Yafforth held of the Gowers; Ralph now bought this from the State and also bought the manor of Brafferton, property of the Cholmleys of Brandsby, but forcibly sold up for their papist delinquency. He is also well-known as the father of Thomas Rymer, author of the *Foedera*. He lost his new estates at the Restoration, joined in the revolt of 1663 and was hanged in York as a traitor. Yet in August 1653 John Metcalfe of Tanton, Stokesley, made a will, with a devout Catholic preamble—'as a poore unworthy member of his holy Spouse the Catholike Church. . . .' He was a popish convicted recusant, sequestered for his popery only. He appointed two sets of executors. George Waite of Leyburn and Henry Foster of Stokesley—both Catholics—were to discharge his private directions, that is, have Masses said for his soul. Four Protestant executors—'my well-beloved friends and kinsmen'—Ralph Rymer, Roger Talbot of Thornton-le-Street, William Pennyman of Ormesby and Richard Trotter of Skelton—were to administer his estate, fix the portions of his children and set up a charity fund in Stokesley of £10 a year for ever. Thomas Meynell of Kilvington's sequestration papers

explicitly record 'Mr Rymer's' cooperativeness. The Wastell family of Scorton were well represented on the Bench and Sequestration Committee. Yet Matthew Wastell (himself of Ellerton) had married one of the Catholic family of Smithson of Moulton. George Trotter of Skelton Castle, now a North Riding Justice, had at least two Catholic aunts and many other Catholic relations. The Covell family (surely of Hornby) had two members on the Bench and standing committee, and we suspect that their family contained Catholics. George Eure of Malton, a Justice, had Catholic relations—though not close ones, and there is no doubt about his own Puritanism. Sir William Allanson, a Justice, who had fought for the Parliament and had a reputation for Puritanism, died before the Restoration, leaving a wife who remarried to the Catholic Sir Solomon Swale of Grinton. Captain Arthur Beckwith of Aldborough and Captain Matthew Beckwith of Tanfield were brothers, who had both fought for the Parliament. Arthur was killed in action early in the first war. Matthew was now a North Riding Justice. Arthur had married a Catholic Wyvill of Constable Burton. After his death the widow apparently tried to get her children away to London and bring them up as Catholics, but herself died in 1645 or 1646. Their Puritan relations attempted to get the wardship—and even if they did, they had little success, since most of the children were certainly Catholics in later life. We may add that the Beckwith family also had a Catholic branch at Featherstone in the West Riding. Benjamin Norcliffe, a barrister and Justice, was the brother of Sir Thomas Norcliffe of Langton, a Parliamentary commander and the husband of a Protestant Fairfax of Gilling—herself the child of a Catholic mother and part of a now increasingly Catholic family. Christopher Percehay of Ryton, one of the few pre-1642 Justices who came back to serve the Parliament, had had a Catholic background to his early life, as we have seen. However, the presentment of him in 1663 for non-communicating may well have been no more significant than that of Lord Fairfax of Denton in the same year. We could doubtless pursue these researches into the Catholic connections of Parliamentary officials further, but it must suffice to mention four other cases, each of which

has a special importance. Sir Philip Stapleton of Warter in the East Riding was a Presbyterian leader in the Parliament. He was impeached by the Army in 1647, fled to Calais and died there. His second wife (married in 1638) was a Catholic and proceeded to remarry, to a Catholic, Frederick Thwing of Heworth. She must have had influence in the Stapleton family, since 'Mr Stapleton of Warter' escorted a group of Mary Ward's nuns on the way to make a foundation at Dolebank, Ripon, in 1678. Dr John Troutbeck was Surgeon-General to the New Model Army, first in the north and then in Ireland. He leased several large seized estates of Yorkshire Catholic delinquents and reappeared in the 1680's as a close personal friend of the Catholic Fairfaxes of Gilling. John Rushworth, secretary to Lord Fairfax and to Cromwell, was an attorney who, as we shall see, conducted a staggeringly expensive business in saving the estates of northern Catholic delinquent gentry by acting as their agent, repurchasing the estates for them in his own name and helping them to get loans in London. Lastly there was Captain Edward Saltmarsh, from a very Puritan family, who, after service in the Parliamentary army, settled at North Kilvington, married a Catholic wife, helped her relations to evade sequestrators, himself later became a Catholic and had two priest sons. With all this evidence in mind, we should therefore expect the actual execution of the Parliament's draconic Ordinances against Catholics to be a little tempered here and there.⁽²⁾

How many North Riding Catholics took part in the wars? It is unfortunate that very few records of the Riding Committees survive and those of the central Committees in London do not seem to be quite complete. There were about 110 gentry families affected by Catholicism in 1642 (omitting vagrants and doubtful cases). Of these some forty-five were accounted delinquents—though some three or four others who escaped with sequestration for recusancy only had had members of their families in arms. The sequestrators did not bother very much about lesser folk and we only notice some five or six other Catholics (yeoman families) sequestered for delinquency or recusancy. Not surprisingly, there is no real case of a Catholic taking arms for the

Parliament. William Salvin of Newbiggin returned to England from Lisbon College in March 1644. In July 1650 he petitioned for the raising of his dead father's sequestration for recusancy, on the grounds that he himself was 'neither papist nor delinquent', but had been in arms for the Parliament in Colonel Welton's Regiment. The London Committee sent to the North Riding for information, and answer was returned that Salvin was said to have been taken prisoner while fighting in the King's army at Naseby in June 1645. The lists of Naseby prisoners did not contain his name, so he was offered discharge of the sequestration if he would take the Oath of Abjuration—and he took it. We hear no more of his case. He was certainly reconciled to the Church by 1663 and remained a Catholic for the rest of his life. His is not the only case of a Catholic student returning in the latter stages of the first war and being caught up confusedly in the fighting. It is also a fact that royalist prisoners were often enlisted into the Parliamentary forces. Thomas Bellasis, second Viscount Fauconberg of Newburgh, certainly raised the delinquency and recusancy sequestration on his grandfather's estate by taking the Oath of Abjuration, then married Mary Cromwell and served his father-in-law's government. But it is really very unlikely that Thomas ever was a Catholic himself. Charles Howard, first Earl of Carlisle, was certainly brought up as a Catholic in the household of Thomas Fairfax, second Viscount Fairfax of Gilling, his relative, but had apostatised by the time he entered Cromwell's service. As we shall see, he did his Catholic relatives good service thereafter. William Metham, a son of Sir Jordan Metham of Wigganthurpe, and an undoubted Catholic, belonged to the school of thought of the 1650's which held that cooperation with the Protectorate was the right policy for Catholics, and he went to Rome to act as an unofficial agent of that policy. Apart from these cases there are only those of very mixed families (like the Beckwiths of Tanfield, Stapletons of Warter, Hunters of the Marishes in Pickering—Robert Hunter served as a treasurer for the Bench in the 1650's when two relations of his were preparing to enter convents abroad) or of long lapsed Catholics like Christopher Percehay of Ryton.

The military record of North Riding Catholics is fairly well known. Lieut-Col Sayer joined the Earl of Newcastle's army, must have survived Marston Moor, and was killed at Naseby. Lieut-Col Lancelot Holtby of Hovingham was killed at Brentford. The Eure family suffered heavily; Colonel Sir William Eure was killed at Marston Moor and Major Thomas Eure at the first battle of Newbury. Captain Joseph Constable of Kirkby Knowle was killed at either Newbury or Cropredy Bridge. Captain (Anthony?) Meynell of Dalton was killed at Marston Moor and an unidentified Captain Thomas Meynell (most probably the grandson of old Thomas Meynell and Douai schoolboy whom we have already met) at Pontefract Castle. Mr Henry Lawson of Brough, a gentleman volunteer, was slain at Melton Mowbray, John Witham at Preston and 'Mr Thomas Crathorn the elder' (not identifiable from the extant pedigrees) at Uphaven. Mr Stephen Pudsey fell 'in Holderness', Lieut-Col Philip Howard at Chester, Lieut-Col Henry Topham of Agglethorpe (serving under Col Eure) at Marston Moor, William Cholmley of Brandsby fighting in Ireland and Thomas Danby of Leake at some unknown battle. Other Catholics, not natives of the Riding, fell in actions within its borders. Viscount Dunbar of Burton Constable died of wounds in Scarborough Castle and two of his sons were badly wounded there and Michael Wharton killed. At the action at Sheriff Hutton Captains William Leyburn and Matthew Anderton were killed. We get glimpses, mainly from the sequestration records, of military careers, though it was much to the interest of the petitioners to play down their fighting records. Lawrence Sayer of Worsall's record is unknown but bad enough for him to be sold up completely; he lurked with a few companions in arms as a 'dangerous papist armed' thereafter. Thomas Bellasis, first Viscount Fauconberg, was taken prisoner very early in the war in an attack on Hull, but must have been soon exchanged. After Marston Moor he fled to the Continent, returned home to Coxwold in 1649 from France. His eldest son, Henry, who had fought as a Colonel for the King and been taken in Newark Castle at the end of the first war, had already died. Old Fauconberg now refused the Oath of Abjuration, was

convicted as a popish recusant and died in 1653. John Danby of Leake was a royalist Major and used his rank after the war. Helmsley Castle was defended by Col John Talbot of Thornton-le-Street (of a now very minimally Catholic family and with a wife of similar background) and Sir Jordan Crosland of Helmsley (who was later to become a Catholic). 'Mr Thweng' of Heworth received a commission from the Earl of Newcastle early in the first war. 'Mr Franke of Kneton' and Mr Francis Tunstall of Wycliffe were gentleman volunteers in the Prince of Wales' Guard at the outset of the war. Francis Ayscough of Skewsby was a lieutenant of horse. Ambrose Pudsey of Barforth was a Colonel of Foot.⁽³⁾

But are we nevertheless to presume that over half the Catholic gentry of the Riding were neutral in the war? Nineteen were sequestered simply for recusancy—that is to say enquiries had revealed no charge of delinquency against them. In fact the great majority of the strongly recusant gentry took the King's part, and the nineteen contain relatively few of this sort. Thus Thomas Meynell of Kilvington and his son Anthony genuinely seem to have stayed at home—but members of their family fought for the King. The Cattericks of Carlton, Stanwick, Bartons of Whenby and Fairfaxes of Gilling were the only other inactive families of consequence. But the sympathies of the Fairfaxes were all royalist. Young Nicholas Fairfax actually put himself up for composition but the Committee could find no charges against him. The family then consisted of a widow and children under the guardianship of the Parliamentary Commander-in-chief himself, Lord Fairfax of Denton, and they were in the hands of the Parliament's Court of Wards during most of the Interregnum. But if we add to the forty-five sequestered for delinquency these nineteen sequestered for recusancy, we are still left with some forty-six families who do not seem to have undergone sequestration at all. A good many of these are accounted for by the usual high proportion of Church-papists or conformists amongst heads of families and their heirs, and the few surviving puzzling cases (the Bullocks of Muscoats and South Holme, the Nendikes of Dalby, the Metcalfes of Romanby) are no doubt people who lapsed at this

period (unknown to us) or whose recusancy sequestrations are lost.

How severe was the actual execution of the Ordinances? Where the sequestration was for delinquency, cases were put into two classes. In the first class came 'traitors'—strong fighting royalists—who were blacklisted and sold up. According to the Instructions the buyers of such property were required to swear that they were not agents for the original owners. About a dozen North Riding Catholics came in this class. The Sayers of Worsall were sold up and apparently denied even a fifth portion for John Sayer's widow and children. The family was already declining, since the chances of succession had carried Marrick and Colburne away from it in 1635. At the government sale of 1653-6 the buyer of the entire estate (Yarm, Preston, Egglescliffe, Worsall) was Gilbert Crouch, a London lawyer with northern Catholic connections and Rushworth's close rival in the business of collusive buying of recusants' estates. As we have already seen, the head of the family, Lawrence Sayer, very understandably went into a life of conspiracy against the government until his death in 1658. His son, another Lawrence, was faced at the Restoration with the large capital sum of a loan contracted to buy the estate, and the interest on it. As presumably in other like cases, the family must have leased the estate from its new nominal owner, Crouch, for a peppercorn rent, and young Lawrence might—had he the ability—have farmed and improved the estate well enough to pay off his debts in time. In fact he did not. In 1670 he and Crouch sold Yarm to his brother-in-law, Nicholas Mayes, a Catholic merchant; in 1671 he sold Worsall and in 1673 Preston. All he had left was a small parcel of land in Aislaby, and he was living in Ireland in 1684. The Cholmleys of Brandsby were also sold up in 1653. Gilbert Crouch obliged by buying Brandsby and Stearsby for them, but Brafferton was bought by Ralph Rymer. We do not know what arrangements were made for farming Brandsby. Marmaduke Cholmley was certainly living there in 1655, but the same year seems to have removed to his small estate at Basedale in Westerdale, Cleveland. After the Restoration the Cholmleys evidently

paid their debts and regained full ownership of Brandsby and Stearsby. But Brafferton remained Rymer's, and on his attainder in 1663 went to the Crown and was later sold to the Bishop of Durham. John Danby of Leake was sold up and his estate bought by Anthony Bierley of Nosterfield—a member of a family with Catholic tendencies. This was evidently a fictitious sale, since the Danbys enjoyed ownership of Leake long after 1660. The Greenes of Lanmoth were sold up in 1653 and their little property bought by a trust, consisting of a Catholic relation and a Protestant. Nevertheless the strain of the debt was too great and the Greenes sold Lanmoth Hall and most of their property there in 1660. The Tankards of Brampton, sold up in 1653, made use of the services of Rushworth, and he bought Brampton, Roecliffe, Givendale (perhaps) and some of the property in Boroughbridge. But the bulk of the estate there and in Aldborough had to be sold away from the family. Thomas Tankard was thus left the legal owner only of a cottage in Buttersett in Wensleydale, which was seized for his recusancy. He compounded for the cottage at a third of its capital value and was discharged from all sequestration. By 1662 he seems to have been in occupation of the lands bought by Rushworth and to have mastered his debts. The Holtbys of Scackleton, Hovingham were sold up and apparently ruined finally. The Metcalfes of North Otterington made use of the services of Anthony Bierley and so retained the estate for nearly another century. John Constable of Kirkby Knowle petitioned against the order to sell up his estate there. He claimed that he was really not a delinquent, and had only joined the Helmsley garrison in fear of his life if he stayed outside; and that Kirkby Knowle was subject to a 99-year lease to James Danby, made in 1642—clearly a form of mortgage. The authorities cancelled the order. Constable was apparently a Church-papist and succeeded in evading sequestration for recusancy. Nevertheless he was ordered to compound for his delinquency for a fine of £373. This seems to have ruined him. The money was paid within three months, but Kirkby Knowle became Danby's. The Ayscoughs of Skewsby suffered a forced sale also in 1653 and Gilbert Crouch bought all their lands in

Yorkshire and Co. Durham. The family seems to have recovered ownership after 1660. The Lawsons of Brough were subjected to a forced sale in 1652-3 and made use of both Crouch and Rushworth. Their estates emerged substantially intact after 1660. The Frankes of Knighton—over whose heads bankruptcy had been hanging for so many years—also underwent a forced sale and lost the bulk of their lands finally by 1660. The only other North Riding family to have a forced sale was the Pudseys. By this time the North Riding properties seem to have been held separately from those in Bolton by Bowland. The latter was narrowly saved, but Hackforth, Stapleton and Little Hutton were all finally lost by the family in 1652-7.⁽⁴⁾

The second class of delinquents were those allowed to compound for a lump sum fine. The Catholics or near-Catholics in this class (who had avoided sequestration for recusancy) fared variously. John Smith of Snainton, a conformist head of an increasingly Catholic family, escaped with a £2 fine. He was known as a royalist, and, indeed, was one of a group of royalist lawyers forbidden to practise in the county and shadowed by Thurloe's police. But he had behaved with such political circumspection that he was not even charged with delinquency and virtuously offered himself to the Committee, in case he might have offended. Solomon Swale of Grinton and Gray's Inn, a recusant (non-compounder) in 1642, played an even more careful game during the Interregnum. He does not seem to have been charged with recusancy—indeed, a priest reported that he had to reconcile him to the Church in 1660—and served both sides in turn. His surviving sequestration papers are inconclusive—it would be typical of him if he escaped sequestration for delinquency. At the other end of the scale was Marmaduke Tunstall of Wycliffe, the conformist head of a mainly Catholic family in 1642. He was a determined royalist and served in both wars. For some mysterious reason he was spared sale and fined nearly £3,000 composition money, which was later reduced to £1,788. He survived this grave blow, but his sale of Thorpe in Wycliffe to a Catholic, John Ingleby of Lawkland, in 1648 must have been part of his effort to pay the fine. Similarly Sir Marmaduke Wyvill of Constable

Burton, the head of a marginally Catholic family, and himself a conformist, compounded for his delinquency for £1,343.

Then came recusant delinquents, a small class sequestered for both delinquency and recusancy, but not sold up as traitors. There was a strong tendency for their sequestrations to change down from delinquency ($\frac{4}{5}$ seizure) to mere recusancy ($\frac{2}{3}$) owing either to successful pleading (for instance by the Withams of Cliffe and perhaps Simon Scrope of Danby) or, more often, to the death of the original delinquent and succession of a non-delinquent recusant heir. Thus the Applebys of Linton on Ouse and the Methams were saved much by deaths—though the Methams were compelled to sell most of Wigganthorpe voluntarily in 1654. There were cases where the recusant delinquent or his heir sought to solve the problem by taking the Oath of Abjuration. As we have seen, at the death of Thomas, first Viscount Fauconberg, as a recusant delinquent, his Protestant heir and grandson, Thomas, the second Viscount, had no difficulty in taking the Oath and getting all sequestrations raised. William Salvin of Newbiggin, a Catholic heir, did the same thing. George Meynell of Dalton, who had already conformed twice before 1642, made no bones about taking the Oath in 1652. William Tocketts of Guisborough, the successor and son of a Catholic, took the Oath and went to church to get the sequestration raised. George Thwing of Heworth, the head of a strongly Catholic and royalist family and himself very long a recusant before 1640, protested very strongly in 1645 that he had conformed in 1641 and was no recusant. It appears that he convinced the Committee.⁽⁵⁾

The 'mere recusants' under sequestration endured something far harder than the compositions of 1627–42. The Meynells of Kilvington, who came in this class, have left us a very complete set of their sequestration papers. Until 1627 they had paid £10 a year in recusancy dues, from 1627 to 1629 £35 and from 1629 to 1642 £100. The only attempt of any kind at a real estimate of their income up to this time was in about 1600, when it was found to be £300 a year. From 1644–5 the estate fell under sequestration. Immediately a searching estimate of it was made by

two local authorities—the Richmondshire sequestrators for the parts of the estate under their jurisdiction and the Allertonshire ones for the rest. Reprises—real charges on the estate—were allowed, and the net annual value for fining fixed at some £400 a year (£500 gross). The entire estate, less the manor house at Kilvington, was seized and let by the State to farmers—one for each jurisdiction—who were due to pay a rent of £282 a year to the government and of another £140 to Thomas Meynell (in lieu of his third share). The government undertook to pay land taxes on the estate, but presented Thomas with a bill for his arrears of recusancy compositions since 1642 (£300) and for the value of two-thirds of his goods. In 1647 it was clear that the Committee was in difficulties about finding adequate and honest farmers of seized lands, and Meynell was actually allowed to farm the Richmondshire parts himself—but at a higher rent and made liable for taxes. By 1648 the bill of 1645 was still unpaid, and the Committee compelled to let the entire estate to Meynell in the name of a young son of his. The rent was fixed by a new contract at £250 a year plus taxes and billeting money. Meynell was carefully refused permission to cut wood on the estate (that was cut and sold by the Committee for its own benefit) and to plough up pasture or grassland. By 1649 the financial difficulties of the government produced yet another contract. Meynell was to continue to farm the whole estate (though it ran in the name of another farmer), was allowed to cut the woods and enclose at will, but was expected to pay a much increased rent—£420 a year. It is interesting to note that the sequestrators now rated the estate as capable of producing £650 a year. It was at this point that Meynell tried a new trick. His eldest grandson had died leaving a widow, who married a retired Parliamentary captain, Edward Saltmarsh. Like all such soldiers, Saltmarsh doubtless was owed back pay by the State. Meynell proposed to the Committee that Saltmarsh was legally entitled to a dower—a slice of the estate—and that this ought to be withdrawn from the sequestration. The Committee showed its mettle, granted the petition, but made out yet another farming contract on still harder terms for the remainder of the estate. It appears that the

net income of the family at best now could not have exceeded £100 a year; they had borrowed some £2,000 over the last few years to make ends meet, and were being pressed to pay the bill of 1645, still outstanding.

In 1654 government sequestration policy was under review by Cromwell and a self-appointed committee of Catholic peers and gentry met in London to make what advantage they could out of Cromwell's hesitations. The Allertonshire Catholics were represented by Major John Danby of Leake, Thomas Jackson of Knayton (the Meynells' conveyancer) and the Meynell steward, John Wilde. The wider negotiations came to nothing—the men returned home with the impression that Cromwell would withstand pressures from his Councillors to put the screw still further on Catholics, but, apparently through a meeting with Crouch in his office, the three Allertonshire men hit on a complex legal way of getting the Meynell estate freed entirely from sequestration. The core of this was the discovery that Wentworth's slapdash methods had left a legal flaw in the whole basis of the Meynells' conviction for recusancy. The structure of seizure and contracts hung on this conviction. The case was brought and argued in the Exchequer Court and then before the London Committee of Sequestrations—and won, and the sequestration declared illegal and raised. It was obviously only a matter of time before the Meynells were reconvicted and re-sequestered. But while the case was on, they had hastily conveyed away almost all the estate to a set of trustees. After the reconviction, the trust was allowed, and sequestration descended simply on the manor house and paddocks, leaving the rest free. The history of this sequestration from 1645 illustrates powerfully the real factors at play—the embarrassments and financial troubles of the government, the quasi-impossibility of making its so efficient system work, the changing climate of political and religious opinion in London, and the real suffering and insecurity inflicted on people like the Meynells.

It will suffice to mention briefly a few other cases. The impoverished Cattericks of Stanwick, clinging on to Carlton, their last possession, are traditionally supposed to have saved it

temporarily by using up the remainder of Hugh Smithson's purchase money for Stanwick manor to tide them over sequestration troubles. They had to sell most of Carlton in 1667. The Wildes had to sell Hunton in the 1650's. The Metcalfes sold Firby in 1657 to the Trotters of Skelton—whose helping hand can be seen at so many points in these years. At Sowerby, Richard Lockwood had conformed by 1640 and remained a conformist to his death in 1646. The estate was sequestered for his delinquency only during his life, and after his death, a part was sequestered for his widow's recusancy. In 1651-2 a son, Matthew, returned home from Douai and refused the Oath of Abjuration. Mrs Lockwood—surely advised by the Allertonshire Catholics—pleaded skilfully that Matthew had been under age when tendered the Oath and that he had not been brought up a papist 'but sent to a Protestant school'. It is astonishing that, in 1655, the authorities accepted the plea and discharged all sequestrations. The outcome of the Meynells' case and this one are only two of numbers of signs that the Protectorate was tending rather fitfully towards mercy. In 1651 the young fifth Viscount Fairfax of Gilling succeeded to the title and estate. He was a strong Catholic—a fact which was not much concealed. Yet he was never sequestered or even convicted of recusancy after his succession. His family had long been under the wing of their former guardian, the Parliamentary general, Lord Fairfax of Denton. The early asperities of that relationship softened as the Interregnum progressed. The general even helped on a Catholic marriage for one of the young Viscount's sisters. Amiable enquiries about family genealogy passed between Gilling and Denton. The Presbyterian and Catholic parties (or royalists) met here in effect. It was at Gilling that was held one of the secret meetings of 1660 to plan operations as Monck entered England. Perhaps all of this, as well as a greater flexibility at Westminster under Cromwell (part religious feeling, part economic necessity) contributed to ease things for some sequestered Catholics.

There are two general points to be noted about the sequestrations of 1645-60. The first is that, in spite of their great weight, the majority of the Catholic gentry survived them. Only nine

families were compelled to sell out and at least six of these remained in the county as recusants after 1660. The second point is the mentality of those few who took the Oath of Abjuration or almost equivalent action to escape sequestration. George Meynell's taking of the Oath was only the last of a series of similar actions by him since 1606. He remained on very affectionate terms with the Kilvington family. George Thwing belonged to the same older generation. We may suspect that they clung to the idea that to take the Oath with reservations was licit. As we shall see, this idea was to recur faintly in 1679-80.⁽⁶⁾

Apart from fining there were very few proceedings against Catholics under the penal laws, whatever the Parliamentarians of 1642 had said. We only hear of four priests caught in Yorkshire between 1645 and 1660, none of them as the result of any particular initiative of the Standing Committee or Bench. It seems that none of them were executed. The Bench can rarely have taken systematic presentments of recusants. In 1655 they noted receipt of a proclamation ordering them to present the Oath of Abjuration to all recusants, along with a form on which returns were to be made to Westminster. It is likely that they did receive presentments then and perhaps once or twice later (to judge from the York City Sessions Books) though no lists survive. The Quarter Sessions records contain very occasional reminders that the penal laws existed—two women were warned that popish recusants might not teach; a few Catholic alehousekeepers were warned off; there is one vague reference to the 'accustomed' five-mile restrictions (but no trace of a system of Justices' licences to travel, though in fact papists and royalists then certainly had to register with Justices when travelling). There is one isolated seizure of popish vestments. In 1656 it was ordered that:

. . . all the Popish Relicts.vestments.crucifixes.surpclothes.
Alter clothes.Quishions.Bookes and oyntment.Chalice.Plate.
Wayfer molds.Wax candles.Girdles and other Relicts wch
were seized on by John Barry gent. Thos Stranguage.Quarter
Master Smith and Thomas Hutchinson gent.be burned in the
market place of New Malton by the Sheriff of the County . . .

and that the Crucifixes and Molds for Wayfers be first broken and then burned. . . .

What is most significant is that this—the contents of the old Lord Eure's well-known chapel in his manor house at Malton—were untouched until 1656, and that the initiative seems to have been local. The accounts of all the seizures of priests at this period place the initiative squarely on soldiers. The only two priests who were killed in Yorkshire at this period were Benedictine chaplains to the royalists at Marston Moor, taken prisoner and dead of ill-treatment or disease. Apart from all this the Bench was concerned with two interesting subjects—papists in arms and interlude players. The papists in arms were few, though some dozen of the delinquent recusant compounders or delinquent Church-papists took some part in the second civil war. It is true that the second war had few repercussions in the Riding, beyond a short-lived revolt at Scarborough Castle and much movement of troops. The armed papists mentioned were Lawrence Sayer of Yarm, Peter Metcalfe and Robert Barry—who formed a band—William Kidney of Malton and a suspect at Black Hambledon. The suspect—who was not caught—was behaving like a highwayman and thought to be Sir William Blackiston of Gibside, a Catholic. At this time numbers of royalist sequestered Catholic gentry were necessarily living in odd places—Richard Foster of Stokesley, for instance, at Thornton-le-Street, Marmaduke Cholmley of Brandsby at Westerdale. There was a short burst of Quarter Sessions action against interlude players in 1655–6, at Bedale, Snape, Balk, Gilling, Oulston, Brandsby, Sowerby. We cannot believe that this was a passing phenomenon; it is more likely that the Justices were making gestures of obedience to a proclamation against stage plays.⁽⁷⁾

The Restoration brought with it high hopes for Catholics of repeal of the penal laws or, at least, some legal toleration. The experience of Simon Scrope of Danby no doubt represents policy in 1660. He presented himself before the Barons of the Exchequer in Trinity term 1660, showed his receipts for payment of a recusancy sequestration amounting to more per year than the legal fine, and had the sequestration discharged com-

pletely and the seizure raised. Catholics eventually received a few honours and offices—but few of significance. John Bellasis, Lord Bellasis of Worlaby, a cadet of the Newburgh family and a distinguished royalist general who was most likely received into the Church by now, became Lord Lieutenant of the East Riding and governor of Hull—in fact the Yorkshire lands which he was now acquiring lay in the North Riding. His nephew, the second Viscount Fauconberg, became Lord-Lieutenant of the North Riding—a gesture to the supporters of the Protectorate who had gone over to the King. Solomon Swale (1660), Thomas Tankard (1662) and John Lawson of Brough (1665) received baronetcies. Sir Jordan Crosland of Helmsley was commander of trained bands in Yorkshire in 1660–1 and governor of Scarborough Castle. Several Catholics received commissions in the forces—the Hon. Nicholas Fairfax of Gilling as cornet in the Earl of Carlisle's Troop of Horse in 1666, Charles Fairfax as ensign in Carlisle's Regiment of Foot in 1673, Sir John Lawson to raise and command as captain a company of foot in Carlisle's Regiment (1673), Charles Lawson of Brough as captain in Monmouth's Regiment, Roger Strickland of Catterick in the Navy, in which he rose to be Vice-Admiral in 1685. But this was hardly largesse or toleration. Bellasis, Swale and Crosland were circumspect Catholics—we do not know exactly when Bellasis and Crosland were received into the Church, and we only know by accident that Swale was reconciled in 1660. He then clung to office down to 1678, even remaining in the House of Commons and no doubt using all his legal acumen. Moreover, Bellasis and Crosland had unusually distinguished military records. The rest of the offices (save one—Strickland's naval commission) significantly fall amongst relatives of Charles Howard, first Earl of Carlisle. Carlisle, as we have seen, was undoubtedly brought up as a Catholic, and then became Protestant, served Cromwell and supported the Restoration. The commissions were not the only favours he secured for his Catholic relations. Thus in 1663 he wrote to Mr Secretary Bennet very promptly on behalf of 'my kinswoman', Mrs Katherine Metham—a Fairfax Catholic relation on her way to a convent abroad and stopped by the searchers at Rye. In

1666 Carlisle again became a trustee for the Lawson estate.⁽⁸⁾

But although so many of the northern politicians of the period had close Catholic connections (Carlisle; Lord Lumley—a lapsed Catholic; Danby—through his Walmesley mother who was much associated with Yorkshire Catholics in the 1660's; Buckingham—whose mother was a Catholic), Catholics had no real *entrée* to the offices they most desired. Of sixty-three sitting North Riding Justices of Charles II's reign, only three were Catholics and a mere handful of the rest had close Catholic connections—indeed, the Bench was, at this period, less open to Catholic influence than before 1642. The three Catholic Justices were Sir Jordan Crosland (who sat once only, in 1667), Sir Solomon Swale (also Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1670; but he only appeared once at the Quarter Sessions, in the same year) and Vice-Admiral Sir Roger Strickland (only appeared in 1683 at the end of the reign and when the Duke of York's star was rising). Sir Thomas Strickland of Sizergh, hitherto a Protestant, resigned his office as Commissioner of the Privy Seal in 1673 rather than take the Oath required by the Test Act, was convicted as a recusant and ejected from Parliament in 1676 and then finally removed from the North Riding Commission of the Peace in 1678. But it would be unwise to draw conclusions about this latter fact and its lateness, since he never seems to have sat on the Bench, and lived constantly at Sizergh. The most remarkable of the Justices with Catholic connections was Sir John Yorke of Gowlthwaite. He was the only son of a strongly recusant father and both his sisters were Catholics. He was also M.P. for Richmond in the Cavalier Parliament, from 1661 to his death in 1663, when his wife put '*Requiescat in Pace*' on his tomb. George Smithson of Moulton (J.P. from 1664) was a nephew of the first Lord Baltimore, belonged to a family which had been mainly Catholic until the 1620's and still had Catholic Smithson cousins. No doubt his own marriage with a Fairfax of Denton sealed his adhesion to moderate Presbyterianism. Sir Christopher Wyvill of Constable Burton became a Justice in 1662. His mother had been a Catholic recusant and one of his younger brothers was educated at Douai; four of his sisters were certainly Catholics—one was

the wife of George Witham of Cliffe and the mother of three Catholic priests (one a Vicar-Apostolic, another a President of the English College, Douai). Sir Christopher had sat for Richmond in Cromwell's last Parliament and in the Convention of 1660-1. His own religious opinions and view of Catholicism are evident from two little books which he published. *The Pretensions of the Triple Crown Examined: in Thrice Three Familiar Letters upon so many Controverted Points which require more than a Single Consideration, Written some years ago, by Sir Christopher Wyvill Baronet, with certain later Reflections on the same Subject* (London, 1672) was dedicated 'To all my near Relations and Esteemed Acquaintance of the Romish Perswasion'. He says: 'Finding all those little Sophisms which laid hold on me, when I was a Child (or thought as a Childe) new-vampt for the seduction of the growing Generation; I am not unwilling (nay, methinks I am in a manner obliged) to communicate what Antidotes I found most effectual. . . .' A few years later came *A Discourse prepared for the ears of some Romanists (At a General Quarter Sessions, in the North, When they were Summon'd to take the Oaths)* by Sir Christopher Wyvill Baronet, one of His Majesties Justices . . . (York, 1679). The argument of this second book is interesting. He says: 'I am not onely sorry and troubled, but afflicted to see so many Persons standing there, who (could they but quit themselves of one or two needless scruples, pardon me Gentlemen, if I use that term) were fit to sit here and manage the affairs of the Country. . . .' He argues that the Royal Supremacy is, of its nature, not really incompatible with 'the Priestly Function', whereas 'that sort of Supremacy which the Pope now claims' is absurd and was utterly unknown to the primitive Church. It is no use arguing that many Catholics fought and suffered for Charles I, since it is a well-known fact that 'the whole Body of Romanists' would have come round to accepting Cromwell. He was, indeed, striking keen body-blows at the recusant gentry from inside information. They were frustrated at being shut away from the Bench; doubtless they were hardly clericals. High Church Toryism was going to make a strong bid to wrench at least some of them away from the Church. Apart from this, the Bench contained a younger brother of Wyvill's,

John Wyvill—perhaps a convert of his, Sir William Dalton of Hauxwell (who was married to the Wyvills' sister) and Roger Beckwith (Justice from 1674, and must be of Aldborough, the son of another—Catholic—sister of the Wyvills, and certainly brought up a Catholic. He married a strong Protestant in about 1674 and was created a baronet in 1681). With some reason, therefore, we may suspect Sir Christopher Wyvill of having exercised a profitable little apostolate amongst his Catholic relations—rather like that of Wentworth and Wandesford in an earlier generation. But all this increased steadily the aversion of the Bench from Catholicism.

The Clerkship of the Peace had been held during the Interregnum by a nominee and land steward of General Lord Fairfax. Appropriately, in 1660 he was replaced by William Moore of Pickhill and later of Oswaldkirk. He was the second son of James Moore of Angram Grange, Coxwold, the Clerk of 1635-45. William was duly succeeded in 1681 by Allan Chamber, who had married his sister, and who lived at Coxwold—presumably at Angram. Chamber was himself succeeded in the Clerkship by Henry Frankland of Sowerby, Thirsk, a nephew of the second Lord Fauconberg, and his clerkship lasted down to 1736. This, and other straws in the wind, make it quite clear that Fauconberg, the Lord-Lieutenant, had the clerkship under his control. But William Moore's elder brother—James' heir—had, with his family, become a Catholic in the 1650's at Hackness, got control of Angram Grange—perhaps after Chamber's death in 1689—and settled at Loftus by 1680. These facts may, or may not, have some bearing on the action of the North Riding Bench against Catholics after 1660.⁽⁹⁾

The machinery of repression was gravely mutilated by the death of the Council of the North and High Commission—always hitherto its mainspring. Their absence threw into greater relief the position of the Lord-Lieutenant. But Fauconberg had only a fragment of the powers of a Lord President and no executive. He had much influence and patronage in the Riding, but he was absent abroad on embassies for a long period and other powerful figures—Carlisle, Buckingham, and later Danby—had influence

too. But decisions on policy towards Catholics, to what extent and in what manner the existing legal repression was to be executed, were made at Westminster. Those decisions were bound to be the resultants of three forces—the mind of the King, the temper, at any time, of the Parliament, and the policy of the Judges. The King's mind was constantly for toleration and the suspension of both penal and fining laws. As for Parliament, it will have to be sufficient here to say that it was always hostile to any idea of repealing the penal laws or even suspending them by one open and official act; its positive attitude varied greatly with the political temperature and situation. The Judges stood squarely for legality and the exact execution of the Statutes. As persons they cannot have been impervious to both the slow and painful birth of ideas of toleration in the public mind, and to changes of political temperature. But they would always insist that policy must be squared with strict legalism. Considering all this, we can see why even the hopeful Catholic gentry must have been very uncertain in 1660 as to how policy would work out in practice over the decades to come.

In October 1660 the King issued a declaration of toleration for tender consciences, pending a Parliamentary settlement of religious policy. As we have seen, it is likely that recusancy sequestrations were all discharged. (An East Riding Catholic in London, dealing with the Exchequer in this matter for himself and others, apologised for not sending the quittances by post—they were in the form of wooden tallies, he said, which could not go in a letter.) So things rested until March 1662, when the Assize Judges broke the calm by reissuing their pre-war warrants to constables, ordering full presentments of recusants. Sir Philip Constable of Everingham, East Riding, indignantly supplied the Everingham constable with a protest, to be delivered in place of a presentment:

I have none in my constabulerie that I can upon my knowledge Returne as Recusantes; and for such as may forbear the Church upon Sundays his Matie our most gracious Kinge . . . in his declaration touching ecclesiastical affaires dated the 25th of Oct. 1660 hath these verie wordes concerning tender

consciences. That no man shld be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion wch doe not disturb the peace . . . and if anie hath beene disturbed in that kinde since our arrival here it hath not proceeded from anie direction of oures. And anie publique act, order, direction since his Maties declaration I am not knowing of . . .

It is always unwise to credit the Catholic gentry with a close organisation; but previous more or less concerted action by them (e.g. in 1603 and 1623-4 and the collections for the King of 1639-40, the address to Charles II of 1660) show that they were capable of at least local concert. Hence this answer to the Judges may well have been made by many in Yorkshire. Considering this and the constant distaste of constables for attending Assizes, we must suppose that the Judges got few presentments that year. As for the Quarter Sessions, the North Riding made no discernable move. But in August 1663 the Clerk of the Peace of the East Riding issued warrants for a pre-war type of annual presentments to Quarter Sessions—basing himself on the Statutes. Catholics attributed this move to a hard core of strongly Protestant Justices. Defaulting constables or those bringing the Catholic answer were fined and set—with dictation from the Justices—to draw up forthwith full presentments. 400 recusants were listed. The list was handed to the County Clerk for proclamation. He pointed out that 'several persons of quality' were on the list and suggested that he needed some particular warrant to cover himself. Although the hard-core Justices and Clerk of the Peace insisted that their warrant sufficed, he quietly set the lists on one side. In the spring of 1664, two of the hard-core alone rushed through the forms of proclamation on their own authority and took the list to the Assizes. There the Judges had issued their own warrants again and received a larger response, but one which was still poor—only twelve North Riding parishes had answered, and only three gentry were presented. The Judges accepted the East Riding list with alacrity and pushed it through to indictment—with resistance from the Grand Jury. The East Riding Catholic gentry were violently affronted and alarmed. The Constable of Everingham correspondence makes it clear that the other

Benches were not thought to be acting. Richard Sherburne wrote from London that he and Sir Philip Constable had seen the King and were using all the influence they could. He admitted that, as things stood (the Cavalier Parliament's reaction to the tolerationism prevailing in the Convention of 1660-1) he was not hopeful. 'I hope to Fence as well as most: I am onely sorry for the poor People that want both money and Freinds.' He had heard that the Assize Judges and East Riding Bench were issuing warrants for the collection of the shilling fine. His comment was that this would not hurt the gentry, and that he hoped the incidence of the fine would be as before 1642—pressed in large towns (for poor relief) but not pressed in the country. He clearly expected that the Exchequer would, as ever, ignore the poor when issuing seizure orders on the escheats of the new convictions, and that the gentry would use influence and legal skill to delay seizure pending political changes, and plead trusts and debts when and if that failed. In general the same writer urged that constables should be urged to plug the protest in place of presentments, refusing to be frightened by bullying tactics. If the Everingham constable were gaoled for this, he would be recompensed. ('Tell Peter he shall be more than Peter, if he will stand to the truth and not deny his maister.') Meanwhile the North Riding Bench was still not dealing with Catholics. Its only repressive moves were against Presbyterians and Quakers, although the King seems to have issued—to appease Parliament—a proclamation ordering the enforcement of the laws, in September 1663. The Assize Judges and East Riding Bench both went on; the latter received presentments in 1666, the former in July 1665 (very few), March 1666 (far fuller—sixty-one North Riding parishes and fifteen gentry), July 1669 (not so full) and July 1670 (again fuller). There followed the episode of the Secret Treaty of Dover (1670) and the short-lived suspension of the penal and fining laws (March 1672–March 1673). The failure of this royal effort led to a Parliamentary reaction, the Test Act, and proclamations ordering full presentments. The North Riding Bench obeyed and produced what are apparently its first lists of the reign, in January and April 1674. These are comparatively full. ⁽¹⁰⁾

But did these convictions and estreats lead to fining? Pending some study of the Recusant Rolls we can only rely on the very few evidences available in family papers. The Meynells of Kilvington were not convicted until 1674—that is to say the full process and estreat can only have gone through by Michaelmas 1675. The Exchequer did not order commissioners to value the estate until 1676. The family seem to have got the Richmondshire lands excluded as dower and the Allertonshire lands valued—ridiculously—as worth £80 a year. Their income was then about £700—£800 a year. Two-thirds of £80 worth of land were seized and leased to Sir David Foulis and Edward Trotter of Skelton—men well-disposed towards the family. Yet in June 1677 Roger Meynell got a royal *supersedeas*—not a discharge of the seizure, but an indefinite suspension of its effects. Simon Scrope of Danby had had his recusancy sequestration discharged in 1660–1. He was convicted at the Assizes in 1669 and 1670. A seizure was made and the rental seems to have varied, during the next years, between £113 and £165—all paid by the farmers of the seized parts. In July 1677 he also seems to have got a *supersedeas*. Sir Thomas Tankard of Brampton (died 1663) was not fined, but his successor, Sir William, appears in the Recusant Rolls from 1673 to 1675 and then vanishes from them. The Metcalfes of Tanton were convicted and appear on the Recusant Rolls, but without note of payments or seizures. Most of their estate was permanently conveyed away to trustees at this period. In August 1685 the Yorkshire sheriff's quittance roll for rents from seized lands of recusants includes only sixty-one names—only thirteen North Riding gentry. The rents (and, apparently, compositions for seized goods) are all relatively modest. The highest by far is of Sir Philip Constable of Everingham (£120), followed by Francis Tunstall of Wycliffe (£30), Michael Anne of Burghwallis (£26), Roger Meynell and Peter Middleton, both of North Kilvington (£20 each—clearly Meynell underwent a second seizure as a result of the 1679 crises), Lady Mary Tankard (£13 6s. 8d.). Thomas Crathorne, Esq., owed 26s. 8d., Anchotell Bulmer, gent., 66s. 8d. George Meynell of Dalton is noted as refusing to pay anything. It would therefore be quite untrue to imagine that

Catholics were free of fines in Charles II's reign. They seem to have paid nothing in ordinary fines until the 1670's, and then most only paid intermittently, and a good many may well have paid little. However, they were subject to doubled subsidies, and these were years when they were mostly fighting to pay off debts contracted during the Interregnum.

At the Restoration compounding commissions were clearly out of favour and the Exchequer favoured direct methods through sheriffs and inquisition commissions. Inevitably they drifted back into compounding. In 1675 County Commissioners were appointed with attendant receivers. The experiment worked badly and the Barons of the Exchequer complained that the Commissioners were inactive. They sighed—as true administrators—for the days when policy had been clear and Wentworth had been in operation. Soon afterwards they returned to sheriff-methods, and by 1680–5 were regretting that in its turn.⁽¹¹⁾

The Popish Plot crisis of 1678–80 inevitably had repercussions in the Riding. The trouble began in September–October 1678 and ended by March 1681. We get a few glimpses of (reported) opinions of Catholics at this time. Calvert Smithson, gent., of Kiplin (a Catholic and often in the courts for quarrels) was reputed to have said in Bedale in 1674; 'The Parliament is prorogued until October . . . I have forty men ready to rise at the holding upp of my finger and when I come on the field I will give no quarter. I hope to see five hundred men killed in halfe a yeares tyme betwixt Allerton and Kipling'. Jeremy Smithson of Stanwick (a Church-papist with a very bad moral reputation) in 1665 had used lewd and violent language to a Justice. In June or July 1678 Mary Sturdy of Scawton, a papist, was briefly gaoled and fined by the Bench for her part in a brush of words with a neighbour—remarkably well-informed for a small farmer's wife in a moorland hamlet. Mary was reputed to have said 'The King of France is our Kinge: I praye God he may get the victory this battle, and then I hope in God he will be here ere it be longe, and the Protestant Ministers must be putt forth of the churches and ours put in, and except all the Protestants will turne they must all be killed, and the Kinge also must be killed except

he will turne. . . . The Kinge is nothing to us, the Queen is; the King is a Protestant in outward shoue and a Catholicke in his heart. . . .' In November 1678 Calvert Smithson was again in trouble for talk in public houses in Bedale. He was supposed to have said 'I and my company will destroy the Kinge', but was acquitted for insufficient evidence. In 1678 or 1679 Michael Pudsey was indicted at York Assizes on the charge that he had said: 'If wee kill the Kinge or any other person, or doe any sinne, wee have a pardon from the Pope, all our sinnes are forgiven. . . .' In 1680 Cornelius Fish (a very timid Catholic) of Scarborough was charged with saying, in his cups, 'he hoped before Candlemas day to wash his hands in the bloode of those that would not drinke the Duke of Yorkes healtne. . . .' However accurate or inaccurate these accounts may be, they do convey a sense of the political passions let loose—and let loose on a background which contained at one and the same time a great deal of typical post-war violence of language and action, and a desire to avoid going to extremes in practice. The Assize and Bench records of the 1660's and 1670's are full of duels amongst the gentry, brawls by men of respectable family and hot words—for instance in July 1664 Nicholas Fairfax of Gilling and Walton fought a fellow-Catholic, Thomas Witham, Esq., at 'Keebeck in the N. Riding', beating and wounding him; in 1668 John Meynell of Thornaby, a Catholic, broke out into a passion of rage and abuse in the York Assize court during a civil suit with a relation; in 1663 two Catholics, Lord Langdale and Peter Pudsey, were indicted at the Assizes for doing bodily violence.⁽¹²⁾

In February 1679, in obedience to a proclamation, the North Riding Bench began to present the Oath of Allegiance to Catholic recusants, summoning them by special warrants. The records are imperfectly kept and it is clear that a good many more appeared than the thirty-two who refused the Oath and were committed to York Castle. We have already noted Sir Christopher Wyvill's remark on 'soe many' who stood before him then. The official action was a violent one, since the punishment (after a second refusal, before the Assize Judges) was the penalties of *Praemunire*. All the old arguments about the liceity of taking the

Oath when under severe pressure were rekindled. John Ryther, a Catholic gentleman of Scarcroft in the West Riding, wrote to Richard Towneley in March 1679 after the Assizes in York—‘Peter Middleton & Roger Mennall . . . did all refuse ye Oath before ye iudge & Grand iuries (except Mr Tunstall of Barningham & Mr Danbye) for which they were last night committed and indicted, some counsell adviseth them to plead to itt, being no certificate came from ye Sessions att Richmond to testify that they had refused ye Oath . . . I was much with Sr John Lawson who though much troubled yet very couragious . . . those few in ye East have generally taken ye Oath except Phill: Constable & Capt Longley, our West Riding is likely to be devided in their iudgment of itt . . . none in ye (*edge missing*) refuseth either Oath . . . Sr Walter (*illegible, perhaps Vavasour*) . . . with severall other gentlemen that already (*illegible*) & . . . Preist att ye head of 40 people swore att Winchester Sessions, if soe my opinion is Sr Tho: Moore & B. Fisher dyed much mistaken. . . .’ Robert Bolron, the apostate and informer, was himself summoned to the West Riding Quarter Sessions and took the Oath. At Sir Thomas Gascoigne’s trial, Bolron deposed that, on 30 May 1679, his confessor, Fr Rushton, saw him at Barnbow and asked him if he had taken the Oath. When he said he had ‘as others had done’, Rushton ‘told me I and all the others were damn’d for so doing, if we kept the same; therefore he bid me for sure to come next Sunday to have Absolution from him; for it was a damnable sin to take the Oath, and that he had Power from the Pope to absolve me; and added that few Priests had that power as he had . . . I told him that several others had done it as well as I, that were Papists, & they judged it lawful; whereupon he said Away, and told me I was a Fool, and knew not how to Judge of an Oath . . . I told him that Mr Ellis, Priest to Mr Vavasour, had written Commentaries upon the Oath, and justified the taking of it. Said he again, Mr Ellis was a Fool, and his Superiors will call him to account and check him for his pains. . . .’ A letter from Fr John Pracid, in York Castle, to Sir Thomas Gascoigne, was read out in court. It listed the authorities against taking the Oath. We do not know how many took the

Oath in the North Riding. The records of the Bench mention five people (the Crathornes and John Meynell of Broughton) who put in no appearance and in October 1679 note that there were still recusants bound to appear who had not turned up. But it is not made clear whether all of these had taken the Oath (but were still bound to appearances) or were bound to appear to be presented with it. Nor is it altogether clear whether the Bench was, in reality, a good deal more active against Catholics than its records show—granting the certain fact that the clerk omitted some names and details. It does seem that the Justices in Quarter Sessions as a whole were disinclined to do more than the minimum demanded of them. In October 1679 they actually remitted the matter of attempting to round up absentees to individual Justices, and we then hear casually of three or four poor recusants caught, presented with the Oath and committed on their refusal by three Justices in Petty Sessions. Some Catholics took refuge abroad. In December 1678 Lord and Lady Fairfax of Gilling, Lord and Lady Widdrington (their daughter and son-in-law), Captain Thorold and sixteen servants received passes for the Continent. In 1679 Lady Southcott (a Fairfax, resident at Gilling) and her daughters left for Brussels. Such departures may have been encouraged by the authorities—on 10 March 1679 Philip Constable of Everingham received a warrant from the East Riding Bench committing him to York Castle for refusing the Oath a first time; on 26 March the House of Lords granted him licence to go overseas.

As we should expect, the prisoners in York Castle, or at least those of quality, were allowed privileges. Ryther comments that the most anti-Catholic were scandalised that they were allowed 'the liberty of the town'. Fr Pracid's letter from the Castle gives us a *vignette* of prison life:

. . . All the Out-Prisoners being call'd into the Castle . . . Mrs Hasting's Room was needed, and so she went into Castle-gate to reside at the former lodging of one Mrs Wait (*of Leyburn, a Catholic prisoner*) who is now in the Gaol, where she remains with Mrs Wait's two Children and their Maid-Servant, teaching the Children as formerly; also the Moors'

niece goes daily thither; and Mrs Hastings . . . spends all her time well . . . and comes every Morning about Seven o'Clock to serve God (*hear Mass*) at the Castle. . . . My liberty of going abroad is restrain'd with the rest, none being as yet permitted the least since these last were forced to come in. . . . Four prisoners died in the Castle by the spring of 1680. Two (according to Ryther), Francis Tunstall and Anthony Danby of Leake, eventually took the Oath and must have been released. Michael Pudsey was sent to Durham (his native place) for trial on another charge. By July 1680 there were still twenty North Riding prisoners in the Castle. At the end of the reign, in March 1685, there were twenty-three Catholics there in *Praemunire*, of whom fourteen came from the Riding. We noticed in the 1630's how impossible the lawyers counted it for the King to pardon those in *Praemunire*. It is not clear how Catholic prisoners like Edward Saltmarsh (died 1689; a recusant at Newby Wiske July 1680, 1685), Sir John Lawson (recusant at Catterick 1681), Roger Meynell and Peter Middleton of Kilvington (recusants there 1681-5) secured early release.

Bolron's informations on the 'Yorkshire Popish Plot' centred it mainly in the West Riding, but a few Catholics in the North Riding were mentioned. Amongst the priests was Thomas Thwing the younger of Heworth, Sir Thomas Gascoigne's nephew. Thomas Thwing was caught in York and tried for treason—not his priesthood—in July 1680, condemned on extremely inadequate evidence, and executed. Bolron also laid evidence against William Hardwick, a priest and native of Brandsby, stationed at Pontefract. Hardwick seems to have taken refuge in Richmondshire. At Thirsk Quarter Sessions in April 1679 two small groups of Catholics were indicted for being present at Masses said by 'Magister Hardwick' at Grinton, and one Grinton man for being present at a Mass by Hardwick at Danby on Ure. The Clerk of the Peace, William Moore, acted as attorney for the King. The juries brought all the defendants in Not Guilty. Bolron claimed to have been present at a Mass celebrated by John Andrews at Romanby, Northallerton, in the house of the Metcalfe family. Andrews was later caught

with Thwing in York. Bolron went on, in company with an official messenger, Legget, to raid the house at Romanby, where an old priest, 'Mr Metcalfe', was taken. Doubtless Bolron also raided Mr Appleby's house at Linton, where he claimed that Richard Gascoigne, a priest and party to the 'plot', resided. A party of Mary Ward's nuns at Dolebank, Ripon, also figured largely in the informations, since this—their second effort at a Yorkshire foundation—was due to Sir Thomas Gascoigne. Gascoigne had originally thought of making the foundation at Osmotherley, near the Lady Chapel. The party of nuns was mostly taken at Dolebank or in York, together with their chaplain, John Cornwallis *alias* Pracid, S.J. It was inevitable that the scare and the raids of Bolron and Legget should have stirred up free-lance informers—the North Riding Bench punished two of these at one session in 1679—and that other priests should have been taken. These were Francis Collingwood, Francis Osbaldeston, Anthony Langworth, Simon Nicholson, William Allanson and Nicholas Postgate. A total bag of ten priests was a fearful blow to the Yorkshire mission. But the difference in treatment given to the priests is striking. Thwing—very closely associated with Sir Thomas Gascoigne—was executed for treason by plotting. Nicholas Postgate was the first to be caught, early in December 1678, before the presenting of the Oath and six months before Bolron began his career as an informer. The occasion of his capture was, according to the Whitby gauger who took him, a stir amongst Egton Catholics and a report of wild words by the man in whose house Postgate was found. He was taken before two Justices at Brompton in Pickering Lythe, committed to York Castle, tried and executed in August 1679. The trial was at March Assizes, and Ryther says categorically that the priest was condemned for his priesthood only—a fact corroborated by the few details we have of the trial. Yet the other priests imprisoned were not executed. Andrew Jowsey of Egton, caught about the same time as Postgate, and brought before two other North Riding Justices, was apparently put on trial at the same Assizes on a charge of priesthood and acquitted for lack of evidence. The whole atmosphere of these crisis years

in Yorkshire was odd. We get an impression of a sluggish and indifferent majority, with two small minorities—one of the virulently anti-Catholic, the other of the frankly tolerant. Amongst the Assize Judges, Postgate's Judge was, as Ryther said, generally admitted by the Catholics to have been 'civill', or, as another Catholic reported from tradition, willing to give the priest very fair treatment or even save him. Thwing's Judge, in 1680, was extremely virulent and unfair. The Bench, as we have seen, was, as a body, hardly virulent or active and sent out no warrants for searches. At least one Justice, Thomas Worsley, sat on the jury at the Assizes which acquitted Lady Tempest, and on the one which found Thwing guilty shortly afterwards. The jury which acquitted Sir Miles Stapleton included—of North Riding Justices—Sir Barrington Bouchier, Sir John Jennings, Sir Thomas Pennyman, and the prosecutor challenged and removed from the original jury list Sir Roger Beckwith, a fourth. Christopher Tankard of Whixley, of a family not noted for favouring Catholics, was rejected from the jury by the prosecutor because he was 'one that disparaged the Evidence of the Plot and called his Dogs by the names of Oates and Bedloe'. On the other hand, we know Sir Christopher Wyvill's sentiments. As for the people—there were plenty of informers, of whom the most violent were apostates (as, of course, were both Oates and Bolron and all of Postgate's accusers), and Jurors to acquit the Catholics who had been at Hardwick's Masses, Protestants to speak up in favour of Cornelius Fish at Scarborough, Gascoigne and Stapleton at York.⁽¹³⁾

The waning of the crisis in 1681 gave place to the last years of the reign and the Tory reaction. There are clear signs that, well before this, a number of Catholic gentry had been gathering round the Duke of York. The Fairfaxes of Gilling, in particular, became bound to him by many ties. Mary, a sister of Charles, fifth Viscount Fairfax, married Sir Francis Berkeley, a courtier. The Viscount's younger brother, Nicholas, took as his second wife Lady Southcott. After Nicholas' death she entered the service of the Duke of York, together with her own daughters (one of whom had married Lord Castlemain's brother) and

Nicholas'. Meanwhile Lord Fairfax himself spent much of his time in London and Lancashire, consorting with a circle of Catholics who were friends of the Duke—Sir Rowland Bellasis (younger brother of Fauconberg, a Catholic, and his heir), Lord Molyneux, Lord Carrington, Sir Thomas Preston of the Manor, Richard Walmsley of Dunkenhalth. Fairfax's daughter married Lord Widdrington who had a sister a maid of honour to the Duchess of York and multiple relations with both the circle round the Duke of York, and the northern Tory leader, the Duke of Newcastle. By 1683 Sir John Reresby was remarking that he had had in one day, dining at his house in York, 'the two Lords Fairfax, one being a great leader of the Popish party, the other of the Presbuterians. . . .' Roger Strickland of Nateby, Lancashire and Catterick, was in the service of the Duke of York; his younger brother, Vice-Admiral Sir Roger Strickland, served under York in the Navy and, being on half-pay after the crisis of 1679, was made a North Riding Justice by York's influence. Sir Solomon Swale of Grinton and South Stainley, in his will in 1677, reveals a friendship with the Duke of York. He, like a number of other country Catholic gentry in York's circle, left the Duke his best horse in his will.

During these years 1681–5 the Bench's interest in recusants faded to nothing. Only the presence of Catholic prisoners in *Praemunire* in York Castle and the continuing seizure of some recusants' lands showed that the old order was still in place.

James II's reign brought all the hopes of his Catholic supporters to fruition—slowly until 1687 and then very fast and spectacularly. Until 1687 most of the old order remained in place. Sir Roger Strickland sat in the 1685 Parliament for Aldborough. Commissions in the forces were granted more easily to Catholics. Ingenious legal ways were found of discharging recusancy fines and releasing the York Castle prisoners on bail. By March 1686 Lord Fauconberg was admitting privately to his nephew that one had to be careful of the susceptibilities of the Catholic party and that Lord Fairfax was only too well aware of his increased influence. Robert Strickland was Vice-Chamberlain to the Queen; his brother in high command in the Navy; the Queen's household

was full of Fairfaxes, Southcotts, Widdringtons. Some Protestants were more sensitive than others to the way the wind was blowing. At Scarborough, as early as January 1682, William Fowler had said privately to Alderman Craven: 'If I turned Quaker they would take my goodes soe I thinke the best way is to turn papist (he added, to a closer friend—"like the rest") and then I should be Quiett.' In fact there were very few converts at this time in and around Scarborough—perhaps he was thinking of Mr Jonathan Moone, a Scarborough port customer, a Protestant in 1662–3 and a Catholic in 1677, or Cornelius Fish, a pro-Papist in 1679–80, apparently a papist thereafter and conformed after the Revolution. In the Riding at large we hear of no converts of any consequence. On the other hand Fauconberg still thought of the old guard as in the saddle, and a Protestant relation of Lord Fairfax's had no thought of applying to him for patronage until 1688, though he was besieging every possible source of influence in 1686–7. The remoulding of local government came with a vengeance in November 1687. Fauconberg was dismissed and Fairfax appointed Lord-Lieutenant of the Riding. The Catholics, Lord Langdale and Lord Thomas Howard, became Lords-Lieutenant of the East and West Ridings by January 1688. No less than thirteen Catholic gentry became North Riding Justices, ousting long-standing Protestant ones in some cases. The new Justices were Lord Fairfax, Sir John Lawson of Brough, John Crosland of Helmsley (and his Protestant brother, Henry), Francis Tunstall of Wycliffe, Edward Saltmarsh of York and Newby Wiske, George Witham of Cliffe, Roger Meynell of North Kilvington, William Pierson of Stokesley, George Meynell of Dalton, Thomas Cholmley of Brandsby, Hugh Smithson of Stanwick, Philip Saltmarsh, Simon Scrope junior of Danby. We may add Sir William Tankred of Brampton who became a Justice of Ripon and perhaps an Alderman of Pontefract, his son Thomas Tankred and Sir Solomon Swale, Justices of Ripon, Thomas Raynes of Easingwold (a Protestant with a Catholic wife), Lord Mayor of York, Edward Saltmarsh and Charles Fairfax, York City Justices, Marmaduke Holtby and Edward Thwing, York Councillors, Thomas Crathorne of

Crathorne, Ness and Welwick an East Riding Justice. The list reads like one of the better-off Catholic gentry of the Riding. Few names of any consequence were missing—the Stricklands (but they were at the heart of the government), the Moores of Loftus and Angram (but their relation was Clerk of the Peace), the Maires of Lartington (but they had not yet established themselves there as the heirs of the defunct Applebys), Nicholas Mayes of Yarm, the Ayscoughs of Skewsby, William Salvin of Newbiggin, the Bellasises (but Sir Rowland lived in Cheshire and was in office there). It therefore would hardly be true to say that North Riding Catholics were shy of office. As for Fairfax, the Duke of Newcastle, his immediate master in the north, wrote in October 1688 to the Privy Council that he was his right-hand and 'most industrious in his Majesties service'. It was Fairfax who presented to the local officials James II's celebrated leading questions. Of the remaining Protestant Justices, Sir David Foulis, Sir Richard Graham and Sir Metcalfe Robinson were openly in favour of repeal of the penal laws, and Sir Roger Beckwith (the ex-Catholic) and Constable Bradshaw (whose heiress was married to a Catholic) were retained on the Bench and so presumably thought impressionable. By October 1688 Fairfax was warning Reresby, the governor of York (himself of a part-Catholic family), of the arrival in the county of Danby and Devonshire, bent on plotting a reception for Orange. That month James II began to go awkwardly into reverse, and the three Catholic Lords-Lieutenant were superseded by Newcastle. A month later and the whole strange edifice was in ruins. Danby (the son of a near-Catholic mother) was in control of York and Lumley (once, as a Catholic, taken on his Grand Tour by Richard Lascelles) at Newcastle.⁽¹⁴⁾

The Revolution of 1688 and the new reign brought with it an interesting revision of the machinery of repression of Catholics. The process of conviction for recusancy was gradually simplified (at first the new process was placed alongside the old—viz. in 1691 the Quarter Sessions proceeded to conviction in the old way although the new process then existed—and then soon completely replaced it). Now a person was accounted a popish

convicted recusant for refusing the Declaration of the Test Act, or even not turning up on a summons to Quarter Sessions to have it proffered to him. This speeded up conviction greatly. The denial of all offices to papists or Church-Papists was made more effective in a variety of ways. The Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy were recast in such a form that the two new Oaths (to be taken together) could not be taken by any Catholic without obvious apostasy (the old arguments for the lawfulness of taking the Oath of Allegiance were made obsolete by the new wording), and Catholicism was in fact made coterminous with standing outside allegiance. Also the sovereign's power of admitting Catholics to office was destroyed by other measures. Henceforward wavering Catholics were faced with a straight choice—apostasy and office or Catholicism and ostracism. The system of recusancy fining was gradually made simpler and more generally effective. This was done gradually and apparently not due to an original plan. For a long time—at least to 1713-4—the Exchequer and government still thought in terms of keeping going the system of seizures. In practice, by 1690 the Recusant Rolls peter out. It was discovered that the standard principle of taxing Catholic recusants double, combined with the heavy war taxation of William III's reign and an improved system of assessment, imposed on Catholics a very effective burden indeed. The new Land Tax replaced subsidies. Land Tax Commissioners replaced the ancient and wholly inadequate local system of assessment. Moreover the Tax was allotted in quotas to counties, and in them fixed perpetually on estates. The doubling was taken into account when this allocation was made in William's reign. So rigid were the arrangements that one practical consequence was that a Catholic who apostatised found it practically impossible to escape paying double Land Tax thereafter—indeed, his reduction to single tax would have thrown the share of the tax which he was avoiding on to his Protestant neighbours. To judge from the surviving estate records of East and West Riding Catholic families, assessments were realistic, and the Land Tax (at its lowest 2s. in the assessed £, and often as high as 4s. or 6s.) doubled imposed a very heavy burden on the Catholic landed

gentry from 1689. They were also still liable to extra charges for militia horse (an Elizabethan survival—but Francis Trapps of Nidd was charged £3 a year for it around 1703), to fees for court appearances and to bonds for good behaviour imposed in every Jacobite scare. Another Statute neatly summarised and improved previous legislation about the visits of Catholics to London—making such visits lead almost automatically to conviction of recusancy. A Statute imposed what was in effect a graduated tax on Catholics for refusing the new Oaths—£2 for a first offence, £10 for a second, bonds for good behaviour for a third. Papists were to keep no horses of over £5 value, and were subjected to searches and confiscation of their arms. In 1700 the Elizabethan laws on priests and schoolmasters were sharply modernised (without, however, repealing the old ones). Informers received £100 reward; the offenders were liable to perpetual imprisonment. Papists' children, on reaching the age of eighteen, were to apostatise at once, or lose all their inheritances to the next Protestant heirs. Papists were disabled, also in 1700, from buying lands or the profits from them.

After the Revolution the Bench at once assumed an almost totally Protestant character, for the first time since 1558—almost, since Henry Crosland clung to office for one or two sessions, and Sir William Chaytor of Croft (with Catholic relations and himself a suspect in 1680) remained a Justice. Searches for papists' arms were carried out. In July 1691 full presentments and convictions of recusants in the old way were made—perhaps for the last time. Proceedings against prominent Catholics for Jacobitism seem to have rested with the Assize Judges and the Privy Council. In 1690 a single North Riding Justice caught an Irishman, Brian O'Bryan, who was travelling round the chief Catholic houses delivering proclamations from James II in Ireland. His address list included the Scropes of Danby. He was handed over to the Assizes. Lord Fairfax inevitably was watched carefully. In 1689 an informer claimed to have seen him riding with forty horse towards Carlisle. In 1696, at the height of a Jacobite plot crisis, the old man, together with his nephew, Charles Fairfax, and Thomas Braithwaite of Catterick, was

arrested by a messenger from London and carried before the Privy Council. The outcome was not serious, but Lord Fairfax could hope for no peace. He had accommodated old Lady Southcott, his sister-in-law and Mary of Modena's lady-in-waiting, at Gilling in 1690. His niece, Lady Carteret, was at St Germain at James II's court. The Stricklands were still harder hit by the Revolution. Admiral Sir Roger was attainted, lost Thornton Bridge, and left to join his King in Ireland and St Germain. His brother Robert had followed Mary of Modena to France in 1688, only retaining his inheritance at Catterick because it ran in the name of his Braithwaite relations.⁽¹⁵⁾

Throughout this account of Catholics and the government from 1642 to 1702 we have purposely omitted reference to ecclesiastical courts. Their part in the machinery of repression had shrunk. They were so generally unpopular by 1642 that their restoration after 1660 was no foregone conclusion. In the event they were restored, but without the High Commission, their backbone. No doubt Protestant gentry now tolerated their interminable tithe, institution and marriage processes because the courts still offered certain solid advantages. Their penances for rustic fornicators and adulterers sustained the social order. Presentments of dissenters, Protestant and papist, soon became (as Quarter Sessions presentments faded away) the only readily available, regular check on the numbers of the disaffected. Indeed, historians of Catholic recusancy have good reason to bless the Cavalier Parliament for restoring the ecclesiastical courts; otherwise our statistical knowledge of recusancy after 1688 would be thin indeed. The courts also had a certain nuisance value—more evident after 1700. The excommunication of recusants still had disadvantages for them. Catholic gentry found it advisable to put in an occasional appearance at visitation courts to secure absolution by a vague promise to amend. We suspect that prosecutions for clandestine marriages, however fitful, remained a nuisance for Catholics after 1660.

The mission priests of 1642–1700 endured rude shocks—the civil wars, the troubles of 1678–80, the Revolution—and were prey to the old fierce divisions and controversies. Yet these

dramatic incidents should not distract our attention from evident signs of hard missionary labours. Throughout this period vocations to the secular priesthood and religion remained relatively numerous. The causes operating before 1642 to produce a surplus of missionaries were still in force. In 1700 there must have been quite 1,200 English priests and male religious, of whom 650-700 were in England. Of 350 Jesuits, 150 were on the mission, and of 150 Benedictines 70 missionaries. Even the Old Chapter in 1676 seems to have found it hard to keep exact statistics of secular missionaries. But to judge from the number in Yorkshire in 1692 there cannot have been fewer than 350 and perhaps appreciably more. Yorkshire (with rather more than 4,000 Catholics in 1700) had 40-45 missionaries (25-27 seculars, 6-8 Jesuits, 5-6 monks, 3-4 friars). The North Riding, for its some 2,000 Catholics, had at least 15-16 missionaries (10 seculars, 2 monks, 1-2 Jesuits, 2 friars).

The first civil war scattered the missionaries, but things for them resumed almost normal courses quite quickly after 1645. Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, ruled the seculars from France until his death in 1655, through his Chapter. For the next thirty years Rome left England without a bishop and the (Old) Chapter remained the source of faculties and appointed Vicars-General, Archdeacons and Chapter fathers. This situation poured fuel on the embers of the old controversy over Church government. Many wanted bishops—of any sort—to cope soon with the ‘tottering and problematical authority that is amongst us’, disliking the Chapter as a self-perpetuating, uncanonical body of anti-episcopalians. Others accused the Chapter of Gallicanism. Yet others preferred the rule of the Chapter to that of Vicars-Apostolic. The problem of allegiance to the government and the liceity of taking the Oath of Allegiance (or some other possible Oath) again became burning issues, in the 1650’s, when some canvassed the possibilities of an agreement with the Protectorate, and in the 1660’s, when the Chapter discussed with Charles II and Clarendon the possibilities of an acceptable Oath. Of course the controversy between seculars and regulars was a constant, and the Chapter’s faithful reserved a particular dislike for

'Ignatians' and ex-Jesuits. As if that were not enough, the writings of Thomas White *alias* Blackloe, a Chapter man, embarrassed many on the Chapter's side and drew down on them from their opponents the charge of 'Blackloism'—that is, the hydra-headed bogey, Jansenism. All of this domestic politics naturally made its mark in Yorkshire. After all, White and his chief opponent, Leyburn, together with White's friend, Holden, were all northerners.

We hear little of the Royalist v. Cromwellian issue in Yorkshire. Lord Langdale, the royalist exile general, in his retreat at the English Benedictine abbey of Lambspring in Hanover in the 1650's, confidently expected 'the priests' in Yorkshire to carry royalist messages—though he admitted there were a few traitors, like William Metham of Wigganthurpe, ex-Jesuit novice and Cromwell's agent in Rome. From 1663, when the Yorkshire association of secular priests was reborn, its meetings were devilled by ecclesiastical politics. The Archdeacon of Yorkshire, a Chapter man, insisted that no priest might belong to it unless he swore to obey the Chapter. At the 1672 meeting in York, twenty-eight agreed on these terms—including Postgate and the two Thwings; but four refused and were ejected from membership. Three of the 'Dissenters' were from North Riding residences—William Pearson from Brampton, Faceby from Dalton and Hardwick from elsewhere in Richmondshire. Not long before this, Leyburn had surveyed some of the Yorkshire priests. The Archdeacon he regarded as neutral on the Blackloe issue, but a slave of the Chapter, while John Lascelles was a moderate pro-Blackloist, yet a good man. William Meynell (of Kilvington) was strongly anti-Blackloe, too inclined to follow the Chapter (from whom he had extraordinary faculties) and too much enslaved to his family. John Young at Brampton was pious, a hater of Blackloe, but a sick man. Indeed, he died in 1672 and it was the action of the Tankards in offering his place to Pearson, the 'Dissenter', which enraged the Yorkshire association.

On 28 September 1678 the association held an emergency meeting to meet a new Archdeacon, Richard Frank (of Knighton, Richmondshire). He rejoiced there to receive back Hardwick

into the fold and give him absolution. Afterwards Frank wrote that the Popish plot storm broke a month later, putting 'all into confusion' so that three priests went overseas and the rest went to ground and dared not even write to each other. The persecution seems to have fallen equally on all the protagonists. Four or five members of the association were taken (and two martyred), two secular priests who did not belong to it, one Benedictine (Roger Anselm Collingwood, who died in York Castle in April 1679), four or five Jesuits, two Franciscans (Osbaldeston and Langworth). The association dared not meet again until September 1683 and then only two members per Riding were allowed, so as 'not to give offence'. There were now only seventeen members. In 1686 there were no more than fifteen—including two newly arrived in Yorkshire. We may well suspect that an increasing number of secular priests, not 'Ignatians', felt that the day of Chapter politics was over. Indeed, in 1685 the Pope had at last appointed a Vicar-Apostolic, John Leyburn, who tactfully set about reducing the Chapter itself and the local Associations into friendly societies and establishing his own authority as bishop. Frank was now the bishop's Vicar-Forane. We hear little of the great 'opening-up' of Catholicism of 1687–8. In Yorkshire its manifestations must have been confined to open chapels and schools at York and Pontefract, to Leyburn's confirmation tour through the county, and the arrival of Bishop James Smith in 1688.⁽¹⁶⁾

Leyburn's tour must have been very striking. With the possible exception of Bishop Richard Smith, he was the first Catholic bishop to enter Yorkshire since 1559. Travelling in his own coach, he visited Gilling (where he stayed overnight), North Kilvington (twice), Dalton, Cliffe, Lartington and Wycliffe, confirming some 2,200 Catholics of all ages. Other North Riding Catholics went to his confirmations at York, Hazelwood and Carlton. In the course of a single week the whole body of Yorkshire Catholics thronged the roads to meet in assemblies (Cliffe 630, Kilvington 258 and 462, Gilling 412) which taxed the accommodation of the little chapels. To many Catholics the event must have reinforced feelings never far from the surface of their minds in the

seventeenth century—in 1603-4, 1623-4, 1642, 1660-3, 1670-3, 1685-8. Those feelings come out in wills—John Young, priest, of Brampton in 1672 . . . 'if by the assistance & Blessing of God Catholic Religion be restored in this Kingdom . . . I desire an altar to be built in Bedale church'; Robert Rider, farmer, of Arundelhouse, Coverdale in 1678, leaving a fund for a priest, 'except that the Catholic Religion come in, in wch case ye Revenew is to be applied to some Priest to Catechize and Instruct the people of that tract of Coverdale. . . .' The same thought came to Catholics' lips in their cups in inns, at wedding parties. It still found expression not only in political ideas, but in the words of apocalyptic dreams. The efforts of James II may have been rash and politically naive, but very many Catholics must have felt them to be fitting. A preoccupation with the Providential design of God in history through small remnants was common to Catholics, Quakers and even Anglicans like Clarendon. The North Riding had known profound religious stirrings and apocalyptic hopes since the 1650's. In 1651 George Fox said 'I saw towards Cleveland a people that had tasted of the power of God . . . I saw there was a Seed in that country and that God had humble people there . . . And that night I passed on and a Papist overtook me and told me of his religion and of their meetings and I let him speak all that was in his mind. The next morning I was moved . . . to speak the Word to him and I went to his house and declared against his religion and all their ways . . . this put the Papist in such a rage that he could not endure to stay in his own house. . . .' Fox visited Egton Bridge and then went into Holderness—another Catholic centre—where he held 'mighty meetings'. In 1665, when he was imprisoned in Scarborough Castle, he says he often debated forthrightly with papists, including Sir Jordan Crosland, the governor, his lady and his priest. Crosland 'treated me very lovingly' and said 'whatever good he could do to my friends he would do it and never do them hurt and so he remained to do until he died'. Thereafter Catholics and Quakers seem to have existed in numbers alongside each other in the same sort of parishes—huge ones, thinly-populated, with decayed chapels of ease. In 1663

Egton had 40 Quakers (headed by John Burdett, gent., Fox's host) alongside 180 Catholics; Stokesley had 40 Quakers and 64 Catholics; Masham 20 Quakers and 35 Papists, and much the same situation at places like Bilsdale, Scawton, Fylingdale, Hutton Rudby. All this helps us to understand the appeals of Charles II and James II to all Dissenters, Protestant and Catholic—and the feeling of Tory squires that they were beset with fanatics of the most diverse kinds.

The arrival of Bishop James Smith in York in August 1688 was the result of another event, less stirring than Leyburn's tour, but more pregnant with real advantages for Catholics in the future. This was a Papal Brief dividing England into four Vicariates and so giving the north its own bishop. Smith only had time to meet a civic and military reception in York and survey his diocese before the Revolution forced him to take refuge with his friend Francis Tunstall at Wycliffe. It seems that the Revolution disrupted the mission far less than had the crisis of 1678–80. In 1692–3 Archdeacon Frank (confirmed in office by Bishop Smith) reported on a mission obviously stable and at peace. Frank had been a Chapter die-hard and found it hard to grasp a new situation, where the Association was only a friendly society and the Bishop was moving priests freely without consulting him or it. Frank knew of twenty-six priests in Yorkshire—he clearly omits not only regulars but 'Ignatians'—and ten in the North Riding. Smith's presence at Wycliffe, however remote the place, can have been no secret to the authorities—not least because in 1693 he had concentrated a staff of some three chaplains round himself and was governing his area with vigour. Yet he was undisturbed. In 1700 there must have been good hope of ending the chronic controversies amongst seculars and coming to terms with the regulars.⁽¹⁷⁾

The layout of the missions between 1642 and 1702 is far clearer to us than at earlier periods—we can even determine the succession of priests in a good many 'parishes'. It is obvious that, in spite of differences of opinion, a great deal of pastoral spade-work had been accomplished. At this period there were some 30 mission stations in the North Riding. They fell clearly

into two classes—chaplaincies in the houses of gentry, with a stipend from 'the family', and 'districts', in which a priest or priests lived on his own as a 'housekeeper' or in a series of farmers' cottages, serving Catholics over a wide area (scattered groups of farmers and poor Catholics, small gentry who could not or would not, afford a chaplain) and maintained by 'funds' left by bequests and by collections and contributions of food from parishioners. There were some seventeen chaplaincies (not all active throughout this period) and fourteen 'districts'. The seventeen chaplaincies were made up of ten which were pretty constantly in the hands of 'Chapter' secular priests or 'Ignatians' (the three Meynell houses—not always occupied—of North Kilvington, Dalton and Aldborough, Brampton, Danby on Ure, Crathorne, Lartington, Wycliffe, Brandsby, Romondby), and six which fluctuated. Of these Bedale and Whenby were lost by Chapter men to the Benedictines in James II's reign. Cliffe was apparently gained from the Benedictines by the seculars after 1665–70. Brough, originally served by Benedictines (and perhaps sometimes seculars) was lost to the Jesuits by the 1690's, and formed the only Jesuit residence in the Riding at this period. Linton, as we shall see, by 1700–2 was turning from a chaplaincy into a district. The sixth case is more obscure. The Swale family originated in Grinton and was there at least until the 1650's. Sir Solomon, by his death in 1675–6, had built Swale Hall at South Stainley, out of the Riding. A mission to the family certainly existed from about 1660—of secular priests. Yet in 1693 the Northern Provincial Chapter of the Benedictines was held at 'Stainley Hall'. The fourteen or so 'districts' derived from small bequests and funds accumulated before the civil wars. These were commonly deposited with two or three priests, left to the survivor and by him handed on to others. Thus John Young held a fund derived from 'Mr Mush' (presumably William Mush, younger brother of the great John Mush—a link with the 1590's). But such funds were very subject to mischance or bad investment. The Association had perforce tolerated the practice, while trying to encourage the deposit of funds with itself; Bishop Smith was to pursue this policy. The clearest-defined 'districts'

were Ugthorpe-Egton, Linton, Kiplin, Coverdale. Nicholas Postgate is the first identifiable missionary at Ugthorpe-Egton, from the 1660's to 1678. On the death of the last Appleby, Hugh, in 1702, Linton passed to an Oxford College, but Appleby ensured the future of the congregation—together with other scattered Catholics around and in the edge of the East Riding—by placing a fund in Bishop Smith's hands. Kiplin was served by John Smithson, a secular priest (probably *alias* Augustine Smithson and originally at Swale Hall in the 1660's) who died there in the house of his relations in 1684. The mission appears to have had nothing to do with Lord Baltimore, who can hardly ever have seen Kiplin Hall. Coverdale mission was set up by Rider's fund in 1678. The other districts are hazy. By 1702 the Meynells of Dalton were—probably with the Tunstalls of Wycliffe—making financial arrangements for Bishop Smith to appoint roving missionaries on the moors of that area. Richmond had been served by passing priests before the wars. In the 1650's and in 1663 priests appeared there—a Fr Thomas Collingwood in 1663. Thomas Thwing, Esq., resided there as a papist in 1673 and 1675. This undoubtedly was one of the two priests of that name (uncle and nephew) present at the Association meeting in York in 1676. It is more likely that it was 'Thomas Thwing senior' than 'Thomas Thwing junior', the martyr of 1680. John Metcalfe, a native of Richmond, was ordained at the English College, Rome, in 1687 and perhaps then came to Richmond. The town was a Jesuit mission throughout most of the eighteenth century, but we hear of no Jesuit there before about 1724. However, it is very conceivable that 'Ignatians' served the district long before that. Leyburn and Wensleydale at this period are a mystery. There is a tradition that John Huddleston, a secular priest (and later a Benedictine, who sheltered Charles II and received him into the Church in 1685), served the area in the 1650's, but this receives no confirmation elsewhere. A priest, Matthew Thimbleby, appeared at Stokesley in 1653. He was a secular priest. The Fosters of Stokesley had apparently maintained a Jesuit before 1642, and it is most unlikely that they had no priest in the 1660's. But no record casts any light on this. Sowerby

was clearly served by priests for at least some part of this period, but we know nothing more of the mission. Thornton Bridge still housed the Stricklands until 1688, and we hear of a secular priest baptising there in 1683, but of no regular chaplaincy. As we have already seen, Heworth (c. 1644–50 and 1686) and Hutton Rudby (1642–4) temporarily housed Mary Ward's nuns at various periods, served by their Jesuit chaplains—and their spirit made it very likely that Catholics in the area around were served by them. Scarborough was pretty certainly served intermittently by priests from Egton and also from the East Riding. John May, a Chapter priest, was captured at Carethorpe nearby in 1676. Kirkdale in Ryedale had a priest (Thomas Thwing) in 1663 and 1667.

We have left so far unmentioned the chief chaplaincy in the Riding—to Viscount Fairfax. The family had bestowed its favours impartially between 1620 and the 1660's—to secular mission funds, Douai, St Omer and the Benedictines. When the first recusant head of the family, the second Viscount, came into Gilling in 1636, it is most unlikely that he had no chaplain—and the probability is that it was a Benedictine relation. The Castle was unoccupied between about 1642 and the mid-1650's, and Lady Fairfax certainly then and thereafter maintained Benedictine chaplains at her dower house of Walton near Tadcaster. From the 1670's continuously Gilling was served by Benedictines and Lord Fairfax became their 'greatest stay' in the county. From about 1690 to 1704 a second priest—possibly at first a secular priest and then a Benedictine—appeared on the edges of the Gilling estate, at Cawton and then at Scawton. He was a 'householder', serving a district which possibly included Helmsley, and was maintained by collections amongst Catholic farmers. The Franciscans had one mission, Osmotherley. In 1665 Lady Juliana Walmesley, then resident at Wilstrop, invited them thither and gave a house, garden and field in the town, with lands in the Dales worth £20 a year. The foundation was undoubtedly made to serve pilgrims to the Lady Chapel. By 1684–5 there were plans for large developments. Lavish gifts of vestments were made, a small boys' school was opened and the Ugthorpe mission amalgamated with Osmotherley. The Revolution scotched this;

Ugthorpe reverted to the seculars, but the school survived. By 1702 it is possible that the Dominicans had already started their short-lived mission at Muscoats, Kirkdale, with the Bullock family.⁽¹⁸⁾

We know something of the personalities of missionaries at this period. Nicholas Postgate's spirit has remained in Cleveland in a quite unique way. The son of a prosperous farmer, James Postgate of Deane Hall, Egton, he played minor parts in the Egton Interlude players' shows when still in his teens. He reached the English College, Douai in 1621, escorted by Francis Greene of Lanmoth, a priest, and accompanied by two Tankard boys from Brampton. Nicholas was a late vocation—twenty-one years old—and started down in the grammar class. He left for the mission in June 1630 and was in Yorkshire in 1631, when he subscribed to a petition for episcopal government. Until her death in 1642 he served Lady Hungate at Saxton or Huddleston (West Riding), and then Mary, Viscountess Dowager Dunbar, at Halsham in Holderness until 1659. By then he was moved to Cleveland—perhaps as early as 1658, when he baptised a child at North Kilvington. In 1665–6 he forwarded to Leyburn at Douai an appeal for a curate. We know that he kept a pastoral register; hence he is precise in his details. In the past thirty-four years he had baptised 595 children, married 226 couples, buried 719 and, 'in all, increased the Church of God by 2400 souls'.

I have always worked to help poor Catholics . . . I live as a poor man amongst the poor . . . I often repeat to myself those words 'Why look for rest when you were put into the world to labour?' At this moment I have quite 600 penitents and could have more if I wished; or rather what I lack is not the will but help; I am working right to the limits of my strength . . .

John Ward of Danby, a convert of James II's reign, wrote that Fr Postgate was a very well-known figure to Protestants in Cleveland. He was caught in 1679 at a cottage at Littlebeck near Egton. In York Castle, on the day of his execution, he heard the confessions of two Catholic gentlewomen, blessed them, and, in the true spirit of the English Catholicism of those days, cheerfully

told them not to fear about their pregnancies—'Be of Good Heart, Children, you shall both be delivered of sons, and they will both be sav'd'. In fact both children died in infancy. His last words on the scaffold were typically direct and simple:

I dye in the Catholick Religion, out of which there is no Salvation. Mr Sheriff, you know I dye not for the Plot, but for my Religion. I pray God bless the King and the Royal Family. Mr Sheriff, I pray tell the King that I never offended him in any manner of way. I pray God give him his Grace and the Light of Truth. I forgive all that have wronged me and brought me to this death, and I desire Forgiveness of all People.

As we have seen, in 1684-5 the Franciscans took over the Ugthorpe half of Nicholas' district. By 1693 the two halves were reunited and Archdeacon Frank was saying of Nicholas' secular priest successor, John Marsh, that 'he humbly betook himself to the most desolate and laborious place in this district . . . to assist a great multitude of poore in the moores. He once writt to me that one Easter he had near 900 communicants and these scattered at great distances'. (see p. 351)

Augustine Smithson, a secular missionary and native of Kiplin or Bolton on Swale, belonged to the lesser Catholic gentry. He says:

I came to England in the year 1660 the happy year of King Charles the Second his Restoration to the crown; much also overjoyed that God was pleased to bless my first arrival with the conversion of Sir Henry Swales and his brother Dr Robert Swales. Upon wch (the times favouring) Sir Solomon Swales, their Father, was pleased to invite me to live with him. Being thus settled at Stainley, that favourable precinct lying under the protection and encouragement of three of the most ancient Priests of the North; to wit, my cousin Geo Catterick of Kilvington, Mr John Yong of Sir Thomas Tankred of Brampton; and Mr Thomas Gooderick of Mr Barton's at Whenby, by this happy station, I wanted no assistance that could animate the tolerable diligence and endeavours of a young missionary; and they were often pleased to tell me that I deserved a cherishing hand; and both by counsel and manifest encouragement and their edifying example were always ready to promote God's

service in me. And they accordingly employ'd me in preaching at Kilvington, Brampton, Whenby, Sir John Savile's and elsewhere; so did they plentifully reward my poor labours, wch made every task easy to me and completed all my undertakings with a cheerful perseverance even to the carrying on of some dispute in defence of Religion against Dr Sammuas (?), Dr Robinson & others who had attacked the Roman Church as guilty of many errors . . .

Francis Augustine Tempest was a poor relation of the Tempests of Broughton, Skipton. He was professed a monk at Lamspring in 1664 and arrived at Gilling Castle as chaplain in about 1676. In 1685 he must have been away for months, at a Chapter in Paris and one at St James' Palace. He was obviously a very strong Jacobite, and the postal authorities seized an indiscreet letter of his in 1689. Whether it was this which caused his disappearance from Gilling, or a summons to Ireland or France from James II, we do not know. He was away until 1693 and just as mysteriously then reappeared at Gilling, as James II, from St Germain, was writing to ask the Benedictine General Chapter to grant him some signal mark of honour 'because the King has made much use of his labours and obedience'. The civil authorities did not molest him after 1693 and the only traces of his life from then to 1708 (when he left to become Abbot of his monastery) are little notes acknowledging the receipt of small donations by his parishioners and penitents to the Scawton Fund. An even more colourful Benedictine was John Bede Tatham—apparently a native of Barton in Richmondshire. He was educated at St Gregory's school at Douai and professed there in 1657. By 1685 he was a member of the small Benedictine community at St James' Palace in London, and absconded thence with £300 of the Province's funds. His superiors lost all trace of him, and it is only very recently that it has been discovered that he arrived the same year in Burlington, New Jersey. There he established a home and founded a family. Although he became a much respected member of the Burlington community, his mainly Quaker fellow-townsmen were long mystified by his religion. He attended no Protestant church and was uncommunicative on

religious matters. William Penn, the Quaker leader, who came to know him well, alone seems to have discovered his past. When Tatham died his effects included crucifixes, a rosary, Catholic books—some with the bookplate of the English Benedictine Congregation.⁽¹⁹⁾

The years 1642 to 1702 saw a great increase in women's religious vocations from the North Riding, as elsewhere—there were at least forty. It was still possible for devout gentlewomen and servant girls to be 'found places' in the convents abroad, but many of the new vocations certainly were fostered by the flowering of convent schools, only in their infancy by 1642. It now becomes common for the ladies of a family to have a connection, generation after generation, with one particular convent and its school, and for aunts in the community to receive nieces, coming in batches. Thus the English Augustinian Canonesses of Paris professed Dorothy Witham of Cliffe (1681), Mary Witham (1684), Mary Witham (1700), Dorothy Witham (1702), and the English Benedictine nuns of Paris Mary Witham (1683) and Christiana Witham (1685). The Meynells of North Kilvington produced a steady succession of nuns—Paris Canonesses, Elizabeth Meynell (1679); Cambrai Benedictines, Bridget Meynell (1689) and Mary (1693); the Crathornes favoured the English Canonesses of Louvain—Everilda (1674), Barbara (1700), Mary (1701); the Lawsons of Brough the Benedictines at Pontoise (Mary in 1677), and Ghent (Mary 1648 and her niece Mary a generation later) and perhaps the Poor Clares of Rouen—Elizabeth in 1671. These vocations were plain sailing; our interest is drawn more to the unusual cases. Mary Moore, daughter of Thomas Moore of Hackness and a niece of the North Riding Clerk of the Peace, was professed a Franciscan nun at Brussels in 1687. The Dolebank-Heworth-York community of Mary Ward's nuns contained three Thwing sisters. Helen Thwing was educated at Paris during the Interregnum and entered the Order abroad. Her sisters, Mrs Edward Lascelles and Mrs Beckwith of Handale, were professed in Yorkshire as widows. A daughter of Francis Tunstall of Wycliffe was professed a Carmelite at Hoogstraet in 1699. Helen Waite of Leyburn was professed a

Benedictine at Ghent in 1648. Frances Nendyke of Scackleton, Hovingham became an English Canoness of Liège in 1647. Mary and Martha Hunter of the Marishes, Pickering found their way to the Pontoise Benedictines in 1662-4, Ann and Teresa Busby of Yarm to the Dominican nuns of Brussels in 1666 and 1671 and were followed by a niece in 1700. It is now also that we begin to meet with devout widows leaving England to settle in convent guest-houses, usually bringing out with them grandchildren to enter the convent school. Sir Jordan Crosland's widow came to Cambrai in this way in 1693 in her old age, and Mrs Belt of Overton in 1674 to the English Blue Nuns at Paris.

To judge from presentments, Catholic numbers in the North Riding climbed from some 1,800-1,900 in 1642 to 2,000 in the 1660's and 2,200 in 1702. The Catholic gentry, as we have seen, survived the severe troubles of the Interregnum with comparatively few losses. They maintained their numbers, replacing their losses, quite steadily until the Revolution. After the Revolution we run into a 'historian's tunnel'—that is to say there survive no complete and systematic presentments of Catholic recusants between 1691 and 1767. We get an overall impression that the North Riding Catholic gentry down to 1691 showed a tremendous tenacity. However, on closer examination we find that it was the tenacity of a fighting retreat. We repeatedly find families, which had sold their manors, sticking to small remaining pieces of property for decades afterwards or moving a short distance away. Here and there other families which had seemed lost to Catholicism emerge again, in part, in the presentments for a few decades. Nevertheless at this period the total number of Catholic gentry families was sharply declining and replacements were very few. The 120 families of 1642 had become 90 by 1670 and 65 by 1691. The overall distribution of recusancy showed no very significant changes. Hallikeld and Pickering Lythe now contained very few Catholics indeed. Egton retained pride of place as the largest single congregation, with 220-240 in 1690. No doubt the lingering way in which so many gentry families declined slowed up what we should expect as an inevitable consequence of their demise—a heavy concentration of

Catholics into fewer and fewer congregations. It is also likely that many new landlords were not resident and made little effort to oust Catholic tenants.

Gilling West remained the strongest Catholic centre in Richmondshire. Of the Catholic gentry families of 1642, the total Protestantisation of the Laytons and disappearance of the Gascoignes from Sedbury (1680) could have been expected. Lartington remained throughout a Catholic property without resident gentry. The Bulmers sold Marrick in 1670 and disappeared from the area. The Rokebys of Mortham were in full decline and sold out in 1691. Before they removed, Catholicism—which seemed extinct amongst them well before 1642—revived and Thomas Rokeby, Esq., of Mortham was amongst the papist dangerous suspects ordered to take bonds for good behaviour. Three years before, Richard Rokeby had presented himself for confirmation at Bishop Leyburn's hands. The Catterick family's long agony of decline ended in 1680 with Catholic heiresses who sold Carlton. The Metcalfes of Aldborough vanish after 1675. But that ends the tale of complete extinction. The Tunstall family, long set for the role of residuary legatee of others, still flourished, and members of the family resided in no less than six houses in the wapentake at one time or another during this period—all family properties. The Meynells of Dalton and Aldborough stayed solidly in place to 1702. Sir Hugh Smithson of Stanwick, created a baronet in 1660, moved his residence from London to Stanwick and his family remained Catholics—if mostly not model ones—down to 1702. The Smithsons of Newsham were still in place then, and the Pudsey family, although it sold Barforth manor in 1660, remained on a small property there as recusants through to at least 1691. Besides this five new Catholic gentry families appeared—the Allens of Kirkby Ravensworth, Andersons of Gayles, Dents of Marrick, Girlingtons and Birkbecks. The Birkbecks had vanished by 1690 but the others were still there and Catholics.

Richmond town became slightly more fashionable as a residence for Catholic gentry. Its Catholic population rose to two dozen and usually two or three gentry were to be found amongst

them—Lady Beckwith, John Metcalfe (an attorney from Lincolnshire), the Binks family, Smithsons, Ayscoughs.

In Gilling East the Pudseys had vanished from Hackforth and Stapleton during the Interregnum. The Lascelles, quite ruined, lived the life of poor genteel relations all over the county. The Smithsons of Cowton were only a memory by 1688, and the Cleasbys, ruined before 1642, vanished finally. Of the old families there remained only the Withams and Frankes of Knighton. The Withams stuck to their last throughout. The Frankes, apparently utterly ruined by 1660 and their Catholicism dead, clung to a small property left to them and became solidly recusant again until they vanish from sight after 1673. It is quite likely that Archdeacon Franke came of this family and that his influence was felt. Then there were newcomers—the Saltmarshes of Newby Wiske (a very solidly Catholic family, which mostly preferred to live in York), the Salkelds (from Durham to Middleton Tyas and Manfield) and—though only to 1681—a branch of the Bulmers at Middleton Tyas, and one Chaytor convert at Croft.

The story is repeated in Hang West. The Catholicism of the Topham family ended with a widow in the 1660's. In spite of Sir Christopher Wyvill's polemics, there were Catholic members of his family. Some remained at Ripon until at least 1706. Four were confirmed by Leyburn in 1687. But Constable Burton was barred to them now. The Scropes of Danby, whose Catholicism was in considerable danger in 1642, remained strongly Catholic throughout this period. But financial disaster hung over them in 1702. Simon Scrope the elder, about the time of the Revolution, discovered a lead mine on his property, started mining operations, and, at his death in 1691, urged his son Simon to carry on the effort. By 1702 the lead mining was proving very unproductive and debts mounting fast. At Ellerton the Franklands, and at East Witton a branch of the Covells, remained Catholic through to 1691. At Leyburn the Waite family, partially Catholic in 1642, became the pillar of local Catholicism down to 1702.⁽²⁰⁾

In Hang East the Lawsons of Brough came to stand almost alone by 1702. The Danbys, Wyvills, Nortons and Covells had

faded out by 1660. The Metcalfes of Firby sold out also, but members of the family lived on a property nearby until 1675. The Wildes of Hunton, ruined in the 1650's, clung to a small property there until 1669 and then vanish from presentments. The Beckwiths of Masham did not recover from Sir Roger's apostasy and no Catholic members of the family lived there after 1669. The Braithwaites, a Westmoreland family, inherited the Catterick property of the defunct Crofts by 1660, themselves resided there as Catholics in the 1670's and then left the estate to Robert Strickland of Thornton Bridge, the Jacobite. In 1702 the property was, miraculously, still his, though his son had yet to return from France to try to take possession of it.

In general we get the impression that Richmondshire Catholicism, once the strongest in the county, was in decline. Certainly the primacy had passed to Cleveland by the 1680's.

The Catholic gentry of Allertonshire had less losses than anywhere else. The Meynells, pillars of North Richmondshire Catholicism at Dalton and Aldborough, still were the leaders in Allertonshire at Kilvington—and, as we shall see, had now put out two more Catholic shoots into Cleveland. The Danbys of Leake, Jacksons of Knayton, Metcalfes of North Otterington, Pinckneys of Silton were all in place in the 1690's. The Greenes of Lanmoth, though ruined by sequestrations, kept a small property and stood by the rest still in 1702. The Conyers of Hutton Bonville, ruined long before 1642, remained as recusants there until 1674. The only dangerous gaps were created by the departure of the Sayers from Worsall in the 1660's and the Metcalfes from Romondby after 1679.

The picture in the great spaces of Langbaugh was also not too discouraging. The Fosters of Stokesley remained solidly in place in 1702, though they had only a daughter to succeed them. Alongside them a new family, the Piersons, had bought property in the town and moved in in 1680. They were Catholics from Forcett in Richmondshire, and were making money from a successful legal practice. The Metcalfes of Tanton, Stokesley, sold their property there by 1690 and went to live in Guisborough, still strong Catholics. Gilbert Metcalfe had married

one of the Tocketts family (who had apostatised in the 1650's) and his wife seems to have become a Catholic after the marriage. The Crathornes, Pudseys of Pickton, Middletons of Leaven, Middletons of Hilton, Salvins of Newbiggin, Smiths of Egton, Meynells of Thornaby all remained in place and Catholics to the 1690's. The Aislabys of Stainton fade from presentments by the 1670's. Catholicism flickered faintly amongst the last Meynells, living in poverty at Hilton in 1663. The Radcliffes of Ugthorpe, casualties of a much earlier period, and now long ignored by the heralds, still lived, mostly Catholics, either in Lythe and Egton or in service in gentry houses elsewhere in the county. The Fairfaxes of Dunsley apostatised by 1660. The Meynells of Broughton died out after a sensational murder case in the 1690's. But there were a few newcomers—the Thwings, first of Kilton, Brotton and later of Hilton, Mrs Norton of Kirkleavington, the Moores of Loftus, the Collingwoods of Yarm.

Whitby Strand lost its last Catholic gentry family, the Cockrells of Stakesby, by 1660. Catholicism in Scarborough was still at a very low ebb indeed. The short residence of Sir Jordan Crosland and his family in the Castle in the 1660's gave the town its first Catholic gentry for a long time. By 1679–80 a tiny group of four or five men, apparently converts, constituted the entire congregation. Two of these apostatised, and another, Jonathan Moone, a customs official, seems to have left the town. In 1691 the constables firmly reported that there were no known papists there. On the other hand the Spa was discovered by doctors in the 1650's and by the 1690's the first Catholic gentry of many to come were sampling the air and waters during the season. Sir Philip Constable of Everingham went there in 1695 by hired coach from York. The following year he was in the Tower as an alleged Jacobite plotter, but in 1698 he came back again for the season.⁽²¹⁾

Pickering Lythe was almost totally devoid of Catholic gentry. The Wyvills of Osgodby had apostatised by 1660. Christopher Percehay of Ryton was presented as a non-communicant in 1663 but returned a plausible excuse and gave no more trouble. The Coulsons died out; the Catholic members of the Hunter family

of Pickerings died or entered convents abroad; the Smiths of Snainton vanish from presentments by the 1670's.

The Catholic gentry of Birdforth wapentake were reduced greatly. At Newburgh Priory the Protestant second Viscount (later first Earl) Fauconberg survived until 1700. He had no children, so the Viscountcy and estate passed to his nephew, Thomas Bellasis, the son of Sir Rowland of Cheshire. He and his wife were Catholics. After 1702, when he settled into residence, this chance was to have considerable consequences for Catholicism, not only in Birdforth, but throughout the county, for the first Earl had been undoubtedly the most prudent and hard-headed businessman of that able family. He left his Catholic heir a landed income of over £6,000 a year and—for he had been a great moneylender—some £34,000 lent out at high rates of interest. Apart from the Bellasises, only one of the original Catholic gentry families survived to the 1690's—the Granges of East Harlsey; and they were ruined by sequestrations and living in poverty. The Lockwoods of Sowerby, another ruined family, survived until the 1680's. There were two newcomers, the Thomlinsons of Coxwold and the Coates of Kepwick—both dependent on Fauconberg to a great extent.

In Bulmer wapentake things went better. The Cholmleys of Brandsby, Applebys of Linton (just, since the last of the family died in 1702), Donningtons of Huntington, Ayscoughs of Dalby certainly survived to the 1690's. The Thwings of Heworth, though in financial trouble and scattered, remained mostly Catholics. The Bartons died out early in this period and Whenby passed by inheritance to non-resident Catholics. The Methams had to sell Wigganthurpe as a result of sequestrations, and the Stricklands lost Thornton Bridge by attainder in 1689. As a small offset to these losses, a new family of Catholic small gentry, the Walworths, appeared at Whenby, and in 1674 the widow of Robert Belt, the squire of Overton, revealed herself (for she never appears in presentments) as a Catholic and carried off her daughters to a convent school in Paris. In Ryedale the *doyen* of North Riding Catholicism, the Fairfax family, became extremely solidly Catholic and remained so down to 1702. Their estates

marched with those of Lord Fauconberg and therefore in 1702 the Rye valley was much the greatest bastion of Catholic influence in the county. In 1663 there had been no more than forty Catholics in this area of influence of the two families. By 1702 there were 120-150 and the number was steadily rising. At Hovingham the strong group of Catholic gentry families was broken by the ruin and departure of the Holtbys and the death or apostasy of the Catholic members of the Worsley family—in both cases accomplished by 1660. The Crathornes of Ness and Bullocks of South Holme stood firm in 1702. Yet the number of Catholics in the parish remained steady throughout—about forty. At Kirkdale the other family of Bullock of Muscoats stayed an island of considerable piety in the midst of a strongly Dissenting neighbourhood. At Stonegrave the celebrated Mrs Alice Thornton and Dr Comber made the family and parish a model of High Church devotion, and her three Catholic sisters-in-law were kept at a distance. The fortunes of Catholicism in Helmsley were curious. Its landlords were steadily Protestant—even the enigmatic second Duke of Buckingham. The Crosland family re-established itself there in the 1670's—a Catholic brother, John, and a Protestant brother, Henry. No doubt partly because of John Crosland, partly through the presence of two minor gentry Catholic families (the Swales of Sproxton and Kirkes of Bilsdale), and partly by the influence of Lord Fairfax and his priests at Gilling, the number of Catholics in the lordship climbed slightly to some forty by 1702. The shortlived Eure stronghold at Malton had been almost totally swept away in the 1650's by the deaths of the Catholic members of the family, financial ruin, sales of land, and the passing of the title (and little else) to Puritan cousins.⁽²²⁾

Put in this fashion, our survey of the Catholic gentry of the Riding leaves us with a very strong impression of aristocratic decay, well-advanced. The effect is heightened by the frequent discovery of down-at-heel ruined gentry with great names, living as small farmers or annuitants, and by the occasional reversion to Catholicism of minor members of families which had cast it off by 1660—for instance John Musgrave, gent. (no doubt of Norton

Conyers), the Wyvills, a Chaytor, Rokebys. Hence as we pass into the 'historian's tunnel' in 1691-2 we fully expect that when we emerge in 1767 we shall find the Riding's Catholicism reduced to almost nothing. Yet, as we shall see, the picture in 1767 is rather unexpected—gentry (it is true) in a much more advanced state of decay and diminution of numbers, but overall Catholic numbers appreciably larger than in 1702. At least part of the answer to this riddle must be the development of a Catholic middle class of freeholders, merchants, shopkeepers, dealers, professional men independent of the squirearchy—and any modern historian knows by rote that middle classes grow slowly. As we look back through the presentments of this period—and of earlier periods—we do notice the presence, alongside the armorial landed gentry, of a class of Catholic 'mere gentry', 'ignobiles' (to use the heralds' term). Some (like the Swales and Smithsons of Moulton and Smiths of Snainton) climbed into the armorial class of the squirearchy; but the great majority never did—the Waites of Leyburn, Smiths of Egton, Addisons of Normanby, Walworths of Whenby, Hardwicks of Hovingham, Allens of half a dozen places in Richmondshire, Hodgsons of Biggen House, Mitchells of Newton, Bowes of Angram, Lowickes, Granges, Liptrots of Scawton, Bullocks of Muscoats. Indeed, what has embarrassed our efforts at rough statistics of Catholic gentry all along has been the difficulty of knowing whom to include on the lowest levels.

Some of the Riding's laity of 1642-1702 stand out clearly before us. The papers of the Fairfax family provide numerous sketches of personalities. The long-lived fifth Viscount hardly emerges as a person save in broad outline. His wife (Abigail, daughter of Sir John Yate of Buckland Berks., whom he probably met in France during the Interregnum) was 'much given to internal prayer and retirement', using Dame Gertrude More's book (*The Idiot's Devotions*) and Fr Augustine Baker's *Sancta Sophia*. Perhaps she—or her devout mother-in-law Alethea (Howard), Viscountess Fairfax (the 'dear friend' of the wayward first Viscount Fauconberg)—had lent to some Bellasis friend the little treatise on the *Meditation of the Presaunce of God*, which, in

a female seventeenth century hand, remains in the Bellasis archives :

. . . In all actions relegeous dutys performed by us we must in ye beginning fixe our thoughts on ye devin persones as in us & geveing us forces to performe them as fore example in Rising say devoutly I have slept this night in the devine persons, conserved and kept from my Infernall adversarys . . . coming to masse conceive by a devout and true acte of faith yt you are entred into a dubble temple or chapele: the one visible in wch ye preest and you pray together, ye other invisiblle and hidden from mortall eyes & by the infinett splendor & glorye thereof . . . inaccessible to us, wherein ye whole Coort of heaven are behoulders of and adorers of the devine persons . . . and when we receive this sacred host containeing ye devine persons themselves in our Saviors glorious humanity delightfully lodged . . .

Lady Abigail was a gentle and very charitable woman. Alice Thornton, in her own way as devout, but implacably hostile to friends and relations of the 'Roman religion', so that she admitted their good deeds with the footnote 'though of the Roman religion', never speaks of Lady Abigail in that way, and calls her only 'the good Lady Fairfax', whose very practical charity and homely calls at Stonegrave she much appreciated. Indeed, the Fairfax papers show that *odium theologicum* and political passions and the exclusion of Catholics from office did not prevent much social intercourse between Catholics and Protestants. The Diary of William Dicconson of Wrightlington, Lancashire gives a picture of a visit to London in 1697-8:

Mon. July II (1698) din'd at the Duke of Ormonds head with the 2 Lord Fairfaxes, Brigadier Fairfax, Mr Scroop, etc. . . .

We see the furtive visit to Gilling of Mary Anne (Fairfax), Lady Carteret, wife of Sir Charles Carteret, Gentleman-Usher of the Black Rod to James II at St Germain, and her distributing Jacobite literature in London on her way home. We see the Hon. Nicholas Fairfax, an old boy of St Gregory's, Douai, living as an annuitant in York lodgings and dying in 1703, as Thoresby

thought, of the effects of drinking '30 shill. of clarett' (a Jacobite drink) with another in one sitting.

Quite a different figure is Sir Solomon Swale, the Catholic lawyer, who had played so many parts in his time. We should remember that the origins of his family before his day were very obscure, as we read his will, made in 1675:

. . . I blesse God by His grace for making me a member of His Roman Catholique Church militant, hoping that I may be of the Church triumphant in heaven. And I blesse God that my self and ancient family have been constantly loyall to the Crowne although I have suffered much therefore in the last rebellious tymes & I charge my children and posterity that they be & continue to be loyall as they expect God's blessing, & I have impaired my health and my estate by waiving my good practice in the law & serving constantly the Crown & my country in Parliament being the first that moved in the then House of Commons the 7th of Maye 1660 to proclaim his Matie King the next day and for that motion His Sacred Matie was graciously pleased to make me the first barronet in York-shire of his creating . . . I charge my son and heir apparent Henry Swale Esq. that he spare not his purse in the good education of my . . . grandsonne, but that he will breed him abroad at school to be a good scholar by God's blessing and about his age of 21 years to admit him to the Inner Temple to study the Common Laws . . .

There could be no more determined a statement of a Catholic's intention that his family should—while remaining Catholic—resist all efforts to thrust it out of the main stream of society and advancement.⁽²³⁾

Notes

(1) P. H. Hardacre, *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution*, 1956, pp. 17ff.

(2) Rymer—DNB; Metcalfe Records, cit., pp. 307–13. Beckwith

—Fisher, cit., pp. 386ff.; *YASRS*, 20/168–9. Stapleton—Harleian Soc., *Yks. Pedigrees*, 3. Thwing—Wigmore MSS, cit.; *CRS*, 4/353ff. Troutbeck—*CCC*; *RH*, 4, ii, p. 89. Rushworth—*DNB*; *CCC*; *SS*, III/xxxiiiif. Saltmarsh—*CRS*, 56.

(3) *CCC*; Castlemaine, *The Catholique Apology*; Clay's Dugdale, cit.; *YAJ*, 23/349ff.

(4) Crouch—*SS*, III/329; *YASRS*, 9/4. Sayer—J. W. Wardell, *Hist. of Yarm*, 1957, pp. 135–6. Lawson-Tancred, cit. (Tankred). Holtby—*YAJ*, 5/433ff.; *YASRS*, 9/70. Lawson—Lawson MSS, cit.

(5) *CCC*; Smith—*NRRO*, Minutes and Orders Bks., 1655–9, f.52v.; *BM*, Add. MSS, 34014. Metham—*VCHNR*; Metham MSS in Constable of Everingham MSS, Cty Record Office, Beverley.

(6) *CRS*, 56 (Meynell); Catterick—*YASRS*, 20/188; Harl. Soc., *Hunter's Pedigrees*, pp. 30–2. Metcalfe—Metcalfe Records, cit. p. 300. Lockwood—*YASRS*, 20/207. Fairfax—*RH*, 4, ii, pp. 81ff.

(7) *CM*; *NRRO*, Minutes and Orders Bks., 1645–59, *passim*.

(8) Scrope MSS, cit.; C. Dalton, *English Army Lists*, i/135ff.; Lawson MSS, cit.; *RH*, 4, ii, cit.

(9) *NRRO*, cit., 1660 ff.; Hornyhold-Strickland, cit.; Aveling, cit., p. 244; Fisher, cit.; Stephens, cit.

(10) *SS*, 40; Everingham MSS, cit. Penal Laws MSS, ff.71, 73.

(11) *CRS*, 56; Scrope MSS, cit.; Lawson-Tancred, cit.; Metcalfe Records, cit.; *NRRO*, Stapyton of Myton MSS, Quietus of Aug. 1685; *Cal. of Treas. Bks.*, 1669–80, *passim*.

(12) *SS*, 40/131, 203 (Smithson); *NRRO*, Minutes and Orders Bks., 1677–81, ff.52–3 (Scawton); *SS*, 40/239 (Pudsey); *STA*, E/62, Criminal Infs., 12 Jan. 1680/1 (Fish). *NRRO*, cit., *passim*.

(13) *SS*, 40; *NRRO*, cit.; Everingham MSS, cit. (Ryther); F. Hargrave, *Complete Coll. of State Trials*, 1776, 3/1ff.; *YAJ*, 15/159ff.; *Narrative of Rob. Bolron*, 1680; Leeds Central Lib., Mexborough MSS, Reresby Corresp., 14/5.

(14) *RH*, 4, ii, cit.; H. Speight, *Romantic Richmondshire* (Swale); *STA*, E/10, A/3 (Moon); *YAJ*, 5/433ff.; Wombwell MSS, cit.; Reresby Corresp., cit., 27/4.

(15) M. Rowlands, 'Double Land Tax', in *Staffs. Cath. History*, III. *HMC*, House of Lords, 1678–88, p. 193 (Chaytor); *NRRO*, cit., and 1690 Warrant; Everingham MSS, cit., No. 95.

(16) Hogarth MSS; B. Hemphill, *Early Vicars Apostolic*; *RH*, 4, i, art. by T. A. Birrell.

(17) Westminster Archives, XXV (Leyburn); Roydon MSS, Dioc.

Archives of Hexham and Newcastle (Young); Acct. Bk. of Yorks. Brethren Fund (MSS *penes* Fr V. Smith); Nickalls, *Journal of George Fox*.

(18) Hogarth, cit.; Yorks. Brethren, cit.; Kirk, *Biogs. of Eng. Caths*; *YAJ*, i/128 (Kiplin); *RH*, 6, ii, pp. 95ff. (Fairfax); Franciscan archives, Forest Gate, E.7; *CRS*, 24/259.

(19) *CRS*, 55/654; *SS*, 40/230-2; T. Ward, *England's Reformation*, 1710; West. Archives, XXIV, f.623 (subscription); *CRS*, 14/322 (Hungate); Somerset House, Reg. Pell, f.369 (Dunbar); Everingham MSS, cit., Select MSS, f.72; Rome, Barberini MSS, 31, f.69 (mission report); 'The Last Speeches of 3 Preists 1679' (*BM*); Everingham MSS, 'Knaresborough's Foul Draughts'; *CRS*, 9/110ff. (Marsh). Allanson, cit. (Tatham).

(20) Scrope MSS, Danby Hall.

(21) *STA*, E/10, 4 Jan. 1679; A/3, E/62; Everingham Select MSS, cit., f.185.

(22) Wombwell MSS, cit., iii/8 (Bellasis).

(23) *RH*, 4, ii, pp. 80ff.; Speight, cit., p. 225ff.

The Eighteenth Century

Recusants, 1702-90

IF STATISTICAL information about Catholics is scanty in the eighteenth century, there is an abundance of sources on their life and mission activity. Inevitably, therefore, the study of eighteenth century recusancy has tended to become a specialised field and a large one; we are not specialists in it and our treatment of this period will be relatively hasty and superficial.

Eighteenth and early nineteenth century Catholics produced a sizeable literature of abuse of the government's treatment of them. We may reasonably discount from much of what they say, reflecting that they were writing mainly for liberal non-Catholic readers, and considering that the tattered remains of a penal code are always likely to seem very offensive to victims who are, in reality, much freer than their ancestors. Nevertheless we ought not to carry this reaction too far. There was persecution of Catholics in the eighteenth century, although it had a spirit, and employed methods, which were subtly different from those of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For most educated Protestants the principle of the Anglican Establishment remained vital and self-evident; papists and Protestant Dissenters must, in the nature of the case, be rebels against a State and society rightly founded on orthodox religion. For the average Protestant, Anglican or Dissenter, it remained a self-evident fact that the very principles of popery were destructive of all the bonds of decent society. Francis Blackburne, rector of Richmond and

Archdeacon of Cleveland (1705-87), was a constant preacher of these views—in *An Apology for the Author's Free & Candid Disquisitions Relating to the Church of England*, in *The Confessional*, and in *Four Discourses Delivered to the Archdeaconry of Cleveland*, in 1767, 1769, 1771 and 1772. We have already traced the descent of these views, in Archbishop Sandys, Sir Christopher Wyvill, Mr Justice Dolben (at Sir Miles Stapleton's trial in 1680), Mrs Alice Thornton of Stonegrave. However, like the principle of Divine Hereditary Right of Kings, this Establishment theory underwent a subtle change of tone and proportion as the eighteenth century advanced. It was refracted as it passed into the light of liberalism and the Enlightenment. Catholicism came to be disliked more and more as the quintessence of obscurantism, medievalism and illiberalism. On the other hand, liberalism could not stomach medieval methods of repression, which were contrary to the natural rights of man. Yet certain measures of discrimination against Catholics, and even Dissenters, could be defended on liberal principles, and, indeed, the whole basic principle of the Establishment refounded on them as an engine of liberal education and enlightenment. However the new wine of liberalism could not be poured into the old bottles without fermentation. Blackburne remained the enemy of extreme liberals, who wanted a radical reform of Church and State. As we shall see, educated Catholics themselves were not immune to the new currents of thought. Joseph Berington, then Catholic chaplain at Carlton, Snaith, engaged in a pamphlet war against Blackburne. As a liberal, Berington had no difficulty in urging the wrongness of the old penal code, but felt acutely that here he was at one with his opponent and that it was far more important to prove to him that Catholicism and liberalism were basically not opposed to each other.

The old and the new principles and sheer political utility combined, after 1702, to conserve and even buttress the new repressive machine created by the legislation of the 1690's amidst the rusty remains of the old penal system. Jacobitism was not yet a decaying and romantic survival, but was regarded as a very real and dangerous military threat to an England frequently

at odds with France. Hence, between 1715 and 1723, remarkable additions were made to round off the penal code of the 1690's. The rebellion of 1715 led to the passing of two Statutes (*1 Geo. caps. 50 & 55*) which laid down the principle that all papists were traitors and should be made to pay for the military expenses incurred in putting down the rising. Still at law two-thirds of all convicted papists' real and personal property belonged to the State. The Commissioners for Forfeited Lands and Clerks of the Peace were ordered to carry out a searching enquiry into the property of all papists or suspected papists, where necessary inspecting estate accounts and questioning trustees on oath. It was expected that this inquest would kill three birds with one stone; it would provide the government with a really accurate survey of papists' incomes as a basis for seizure or new taxation of them; it would uncover illicit buying of estates by papists; it would lay bare the papists' system for financing missions and religious houses and colleges. All funds for missions, Mass foundations, dowers for nuns, bursaries or collections for colleges thus uncovered were to be confiscated. This inquest was to become a regular thing—that is to say all heirs to estates on succession (or reaching the age of twenty-one after succession) were to register their estates in full detail at Quarter Sessions before the Clerk of the Peace. In 1717 a further Statute (*3 Geo. cap. 18*) extended this compulsory registration to all sales of lands by papists and to all their 'devises'—trusts, marriage settlements, mortgages. Finally, in 1723, came (*9 Geo. cap. 18*) the first special tax on papists. The inquest of 1716 had shown that two-thirds of all papists' estates amounted in value to £384,950 a year. It was decided to take the sum of £100,000 from this. The shares of the sum allocated to counties give us some idea of the relative distribution of Catholics. Yorkshire came far ahead of all other counties, with £13,272, followed by Lancashire (£7,110), Staffordshire (£5,247), Northumberland (£5,148), Lincolnshire (£4,654), Middlesex (£4,174), Durham (£3,611), Northamptonshire (£3,310). The North Riding alone (£5,685) came second after Lancashire, the West Riding (£5,029) fifth and the East Riding (£2,197) well down the list.

The allotment of these shares amongst Catholics within counties was to follow the standard proportions of the Land Tax; like the Land Tax, the papist tax was to be paid by the immediate tenants of lands, but the sum deducted by them (again, as for the Land Tax) from their rents due to their landlords (if papists). It was emphasised that this tax was an extra, over and above an ordinary annual Land Tax voted for 1723—on which Catholics, of course, paid double. The system of registration remained in full force until 1791. But the special tax of 1723 was never repeated.

The double Land Tax for Catholics remained in operation throughout the century and on into the nineteenth century. As we have seen, it was fixed on land in such a fashion that even apostates found it exceedingly hard to escape. Added to this, George I's governments increased the fines on Catholics caught teaching and raised the rewards paid to informers—particularly to those who discovered moneys given to superstitious uses.

But how Jacobite were North Riding Catholics? The local evidence is not very illuminating. The Fairfaxes were naturally regarded with great suspicion for many years because of their strong Jacobite connections. Their relation, Sir Charles Carteret, Black Rod at the court of St Germain-en-Laye, died there in 1719. His widow (née Fairfax) retired to live at Dunkirk until her death there in 1740. Their numerous children mostly figured in the ranks of the Jacobites. Jean-Frédéric-Cyr Carteret became a priest, Doctor of Divinity of Paris, canon of Lille and, in 1742, chaplain-extraordinary to Prince Charles Edward. His brother Edward Carteret became a Jesuit and ended his days as a missionary at Wigan. Philip Cateret also became a Jesuit and English Provincial, and was an intimate of James III. Francis Carteret became a Benedictine, corresponded with the Gilling family and was chaplain to the Widdrington family at Bath. Thomas Fairfax, a cousin of Lord Fairfax, was a prominent Jesuit, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, in James II's reign and a strong Jacobite. It is therefore not surprising that the posts to and from Gilling were especially watched and the house searched at every Jacobite crisis. In 1715 the sixth Viscount was a sickly boy and

gravely ill with the gout in York. He was put on bond but allowed the liberty of the town by the deputy-lieutenant. He died in December 1715. His uncle and successor, the seventh Viscount, was not a man of action and died unmarried in 1719. The title and estate passed to a distant cousin, William Fairfax, who had long dragged out a penurious existence 'in the Imperial service' and, latterly, in French garrison towns in Northern France. His succession as eighth Viscount brought an even greater concentration of official suspicion on Gilling. Lord Widdrington, a close relation, had been attainted for his part in the '15. The new Viscount Fairfax had long ago married into the ranks of the aristocratic Irish military exiles in the French service, and several of his children had married the same way, or to members of the French military *noblesse*. One of his nephews, the Abbé Waters (*alias* Duvivier, really an English Benedictine), was to be confessor to Prince Charles Edward and the Duchess of Albany in Rome. Unfortunately, full as the Fairfax papers of this century are on all other topics, they give almost no hint as to the political feelings of the Lords Fairfax—at least, before the 1760's. We are assured that there still exists a set of wine-glasses of a common Jacobite pattern, engraved with the Fairfax arms; and it does seem overwhelmingly likely that the family—at least until about 1744–5—had quite strong Jacobite sympathies. The eighth Viscount died in 1736 and was succeeded by his only surviving son, Charles Fairfax, the ninth and last Viscount. By 1745 the Widdrington connection had waned and Fairfax's chief friend was undoubtedly the very able and versatile Sir Edward Gascoigne of Parlington. Gascoigne was living in the guest-house of the English Benedictine convent at Cambrai in 1745–6 with his wife and family. His voluminous papers and correspondence make it clear that his residence abroad had nothing to do with Jacobite feeling. He, on hearing of the rebellion of 1745, wrote to his close friend, Lord Irwin, to pass on to the Duke of Newcastle his sentiments:

. . . we Rom: Catholicks are oblig'd to behave with all the duty and Allegiance of true Faithfull Subjects to his Majesty on the Throne . . . in the same manner as if we were

admitted to take an Oath of so doing . . . I was from my Infancy taught to know I had nothing to do with Politicks . . . Of Prince Charles Edward's army he wrote:

. . . these presumptuous Disturbers of the Publick Peace . . . such Herds of Wild creatures . . . on the scamper . . . unworthy Tooles [sc. of the French] . . . we are treated with great Tenderness and Lenity by the Government . . .

There is some evidence that—with whatever sentimental feelings for the Prince—Fairfax concurred with these expressions. As the Jacobite army marched south, there was a panic in York and stories spread that Gilling Castle contained a great store of arms and men ready to rise in revolt. An officer was sent to the Castle from York, found nothing and Fairfax drank King George II's health with him cheerfully. The rector of Gilling, at his own expense, inserted in a York newspaper an announcement that he had personally investigated in the Castle, found nothing wrong, and ascertained that the source of the rumour was a foolish tenant-farmer of Lord Fairfax's—a Catholic bent, in his cups, on impressing his neighbours. After this there is scanty but convincing evidence that Lord Fairfax became a model—if inactive—citizen. He followed Parliamentary debates closely, bought maps of America and India and pins so as to follow the course of the Seven Years War, cooperated warmly in local turnpike ventures, subscribed to the new Burlington Assembly Rooms in York and frequented them. His political sympathies lay with the Rockingham Whigs, and particularly with Mr Burke. In the American War he was loyal—though perhaps slightly embarrassed by the reception of a warm letter from a French nephew of his, serving with the French Fleet against the British in West Indian waters; but, in the civilised fashion of the times, the letter was personally sent on with compliments by a Yorkshire naval captain who had taken wine with the young French officer during a truce.⁽¹⁾

The Strickland family vied with the Fairfaxes in strength of Jacobite connections. Admiral Sir Roger Strickland died at St Germain in 1717. His brother, Robert, died there in 1707, leaving three sons. Francis Strickland, the youngest, took service

in the French army, was seconded for the '45 invasion and had the distinction of being the only North Riding Catholic whom we can certainly identify as a rebel then. He died at Derby on the line of march. Mannock Strickland, the middle son, returned to England and became a London conveyancer. The eldest son, Roger Strickland, was a page at the Jacobite court, served in the French army and then came back to Yorkshire in 1718 to make good his claims to the Braithwaite inheritance at Catterick—successfully. He married a Scrope of Danby and settled in Richmond. In 1745 he was inevitably arrested and closely questioned, but soon convinced the authorities that he was no danger. The papers of the Lawson family at Brough contain a copy of an invitation of 1745 to join the Jacobite army, sent by the Earl of Perth—but there seems to be no evidence that anyone moved from Brough in answer to it. Similarly, although there is a tradition that the Scropes of Danby stored arms for use in the '45, their papers contain no evidence whatever of Jacobite activity at any period.⁽²⁾

The Quarter Sessions records cast little light on Jacobitism. There are long lists of 'Papists, suspected papists and non-jurors, suspected persons', summoned to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy in 1708, 1714-6, 1744-6, some references to systematic searches for arms in Catholic houses, and a very small handful of prosecutions of persons in Ugthorpe, Leyburn and elsewhere for Jacobite expressions. We get an impression that Jacobitism was quite strong in the Riding in the 1690's, that by 1715 it was already fading and in 1745 a mere sentiment, even amongst Catholics. The records for 1745-6 are more concerned with fodder and billeting for troops than with bonds on Catholics and searches for arms in their houses. At Scarborough then a voluntary subscription was raised 'for the payment of such forces as shall be raised for the Defence of the County of York'. Two Catholics—admittedly converts—Stephen and Henry Redhead, tradesmen of the town, each subscribed five shillings to the fund.⁽³⁾

How much real persecution of Catholics was there at this period? In the first place, the Bench after 1702 never contained

men even remotely suspected of Catholicism or closely related to Catholics. This was now made easy for the government—for the first time since 1558—by the contemporary very sharp decline in the number of Catholic gentry families and the near cessation of mixed marriages. The Clerks of the Peace were now people much concerned with Catholics, since the laborious system of land registration depended on them—and since, now that the old type of systematic presentments of recusants to Quarter Sessions had ceased (after 1706), the compiling of lists of papists for bonds and searches depended on the Clerk's memory and local knowledge. From 1689 to 1736 the Clerk was Henry Frankland of Sowerby—the last of the series of Clerks under the wing of the Lords Fauconberg. He was a nephew of the first Earl Fauconberg and cousin of the Catholic third and fourth Viscounts Fauconberg. After 1736 the political centres of gravity of the Riding were clearly at Castle Howard and at Malton. The Earl of Carlisle at Castle Howard exercised great influence; and there is evidence that, throughout the century, that influence was invariably used as a shelter for Catholics in trouble. But the Marquis of Rockingham's citadel at Malton wielded even more power and the Clerkship passed, in succession, to Rockingham's estate agent, James Preston (clerk 1736–62) and his son (clerk 1762—when he was only 16 years of age—to 1787), another James. There is evidence that relations between Gilling and Newburgh on the one hand, and Malton on the other, were friendly—if rather distant. The county administration settled into a rut, in a spirit of 'live and let live', where the quality were concerned. The bonding and searches of Catholic gentry were carried out, but without brutal efficiency. In 1745 'Mr Gordon gent residing with Mr Salvin at Easingwold' was put on the usual bond for good behaviour, though it must have been evident that he was a priest (in fact a Franciscan). In 1746 one of the rare informations came in—'John Audaer of Nunnington, a Roman Catholick, at Whitby, 20 miles from Nunnington and he had no licence to go that far'. In 1743 the constables and searchers at Brampton reported that the Tankreds' guns and horses 'appeared not to us to be more than for Gentlemen to use & will be

allowed them & not siezed nor taken . . . And the said Horses seemed too few for their Common Occasions and not employ'd for other purposes so not taken away. . . .' At Brough likewise, the Lawsons' guns and horses were 'no more than is Common for Gentlemen to use. . . .' (4)

The administration of the taxes depended on the Commissioners of the Land Tax and not the Justices or Clerk. The assessments had been fixed once and for all to estates in the 1690's—though we meet in the West Riding with cases of assessments increased in the course of the eighteenth century. We have no reason to doubt the ninth Lord Fairfax's judgment in 1760 that the weight of the double Land Tax was 'severe' for Catholics, though we still await some detailed study of its exact incidence. The eighteenth century was a period when prices were generally rising and, as in the later sixteenth century, landowners rising and falling—and much depended on their financial ability. Fairfax, from the 1750's, sold over half his lands. Although tragedy hit the family and deprived him in rapid succession of all his children save one neurotic unmarried daughter, it is hard to believe that this was the only reason for the sales. The eighth Viscount, swept in 1719 from penury to wealth, soon fell deeply into debt owing to wild spending. His son and their agent, the Catholic Francis Cholmley of Brandsby, rescued the estate by taking it out of the hands of the old Lord, selling the woods and economising. But after this feat the ninth Viscount proved to be a curious mixture of financial timidity and folly. His sales of land were accompanied by foolish investments of the money and by grandiose building schemes at Gilling and in York. Therefore his judgments on the weight of taxation must be taken with caution. The first Earl Fauconberg was a good manager and a money-lender and in 1700 the Catholic third Viscount succeeded to an estate in Yorkshire alone worth over £3,000 a year, with other estates outside the county and some £34,000 in cash or notes. In 1700 the recusancy charge on the estate (presumably in Yorkshire)—by double Land Tax—was reckoned as £130 a year. That does not appear to be crippling—though the fourth Viscount was exceedingly annoyed in 1734,

after his apostasy, when even an appeal to the Lord Chancellor could not get the Commissioners to discharge the doubled tax. The Fairfax papers contain one isolated reference to another charge on Catholics in the mid-eighteenth century—a strange survival, the levying of extra militia horses from papists. Pending more information about the general conditions of the finances of North Riding Catholics in this period, we are probably justified in saying that the doubled Tax was unlikely to cripple Catholics who were otherwise prospering from other sources of income than land, from agrarian improvement, or from the acquisition of new lands by inheritance, but that it might well have proved the last straw to the improvident or spend-thrift.⁽⁵⁾

There is little sign that the fierce legislation of the 1690's and 1715-23 endangered the property arrangements of the Catholic gentry and yeomen. The ninth Lord Fairfax for a time evaded the force of a Statute denying to Catholics the ownership of Anglican rectories and advowsons—by letting the advowson of Gilling pass under the name of (the now apostate) Viscount Fauconberg. But in the end he was deprived of the advowson. However this did not mean that Catholics could now draw no profit from Church property. The prebendal manor of Ampleforth remained solidly in the hands of Fairfaxes from the mid-sixteenth century to the early nineteenth century by a long series of renewable leases for three lives. The trusts which owned Catholic estates invariably continued unchecked. It was now becoming less common to employ local Protestant neighbours as trustees and we are in the age of the great Catholic conveyancer, Nathaniel Pigott of Whitton, whose spidery script can be found in the family records of almost every Yorkshire Catholic gentry family, whose pithy opinions sheltered them effectively at every turn. The eighth Viscount Fairfax married one of his daughters to Nathaniel's son, Ralph Pigott, and it was their descendants who eventually inherited the Gilling estate. We have found only one piece of evidence of a Protestant next heir attempting to intervene in the succession of a Catholic estate. In 1715 Henry Culpepper Fairfax wrote from Oriel College, Oxford, to his elder brother, the sixth

Baron Fairfax of Cameron, that 'Lord Fairfax of Gilling is very weak, and, if he dies, Walton and other Mannours will fall to you as next Protestant heir. . . .' But the attempt failed. Nor is there much sign that mission funds, nuns' dowers and college funds were put into peril by the new Statutes. Such funds accumulated faster now. The Catholic gentry commonly held the money, paying interest as on a loan. But as the century moved on, the gentry's ranks thinned greatly and gilt-edged securities appeared—and ecclesiastical funds came normally to be invested in a layman's name. We get an impression that even the legal authorities showed increasing tolerance when they came across such Catholic funds. Catholics became gradually aware that they could get away with blatant illegalities—but even so, were disinclined to tempt Providence. Thus in the 1730's a quarrel developed between the eighth Lord Fairfax and George Fairfax *alias* Robinson, a Benedictine missionary and some sort of relative. Robinson was the financial agent in England of his monastery, Lambspring. The quarrel led to a Chancery suit, in which the litigants' involvement in Lambspring funds was freely mentioned in court. Yet there is no evidence that the funds were confiscated as a result of this. In the 1760's the ninth Lord Fairfax was concerned in the affairs of several Catholic families as a trustee. In one case—of the Hungates of Saxton—he was a trustee of the estate of Sir Charles Hungate who was a lunatic and the accounts passed through Chancery without damage. In another case, the trust of the Gascoigne estates for Sir Thomas Gascoigne, a Catholic minor, Fairfax tried hard to persuade his fellow-trustees to bring a Chancery suit so that the trustees' accounts could be audited and registered there as a safeguard. His fellow-trustees refused, pointing out the danger that the accounts might reveal the presence of chaplains, and that the court might send Sir Thomas to a Protestant school or to the University. In 1759 a York ecclesiastical court (most likely the Chancery) dealt with a dispute about the children's portions of two daughters of Sir Thomas Tankred of Brampton. It was noted in court that Sir Thomas had made his bequests to the daughters conditional on their surviving the age of twenty-one and not being 'Profess'd

in a Religious Life abroad'. The court took cognisance that both girls were professed nuns.⁽⁶⁾

Increasing tolerance quite clearly affected the position of priests. The passage in 1700 of the perpetual imprisonment Statute of itself implied that public opinion would no longer stand for the execution of the Elizabethan treason Statute. But it soon became evident that even the penalty of the Statute of 1700 was unenforceable. We hear of numbers of threats to priests from informers—threats which were almost invariably sufficient to cause the priest to leave the county or the country hurriedly, but which were never carried into effect. In 1708 the North Riding Quarter Sessions issued (no doubt in response to an information) a warrant for the arrest of John Danby, the secular missionary of Ugthorpe. It was not executed, and Danby does not seem to have left the county. But the real test came in 1745–6 when no less than six priests were arrested in Yorkshire—apparently all at the behest of informers—and carried before Justices in Petty Sessions, who committed them to York Castle for trial at the next Assizes. Three of the priests were North Riding missionaries—Luke Potts, and Monoux Hervey, taken in the Egton-Ugthorpe area, and William Anderson taken at Crathorne. Protestant public opinion in Cleveland was rampantly hostile to Catholics. In December 1746 a mob at Stokesley attacked the Catholic 'mass-house', pulling off its tiles. Catholics applied to a local Justice for protection, but he temporised. A second mob deliberately demolished the chapel, took out the vestments and paraded them through the town derisively before destroying them. The local Catholics could obtain no redress for this. The prospects for the priests awaiting trial at the Lent Assizes of 1746 therefore appeared to be bad. Hervey noted bitterly that, for fear of prosecution under the Elizabethan Statute on harbouring priests, his parishioners refused universally to hide him in their houses. A number of Catholic gentry subscribed a fund for the priests' defence. The case seemed straightforward, since the priests all seem to have confessed their priesthood when under a first examination. They were found not guilty. Nevertheless they were not released from the Castle until 1747, apparently

after giving an undertaking that they would quit the county.

In 1774-80—amidst all the counter-excitements of the Yorkshire Reform Movement and the first Catholic Relief Act—Yorkshire Catholics were engrossed in the Bolton affair. The sole survivor of the Gilling family by then was the Hon. Anne Fairfax a neurotic and almost helpless spinster. Her father, the ninth Lord, had left her to the care of Anselm Bolton, the Gilling Benedictine chaplain. In 1774 the Pigotts, poor relations of Miss Fairfax and the eventual heirs to her property, prevailed on her to make a deed granting them substantial annuities. Bolton, acting through a Catholic conveyancer relation of his, brought a Chancery suit in an attempt to annul the deed. Once the case became public property Catholics took sides vociferously. The extreme liberal Catholics and at least some secular priests were much inclined to accept the plea of the Pigotts (who were also Catholics) that this was a case of undue clerical influence. However the Pigotts also seem to have made unwise threats, and Bolton had a good deal of public support—for instance from the Lawsons of Brough. Bolton won his case, though it required an expensive private Act of Parliament to annul the deed. No sooner was this case settled than, in 1785, Fr Bolton was again in trouble. The Protestant father of a Gilling maidservant whom the priest had received into the Church informed on him and Bolton found himself committed to York Castle to face indictment at the Assizes for treason—under Statutes of 23 *Eliz.* and 3 *Jas. I.* for reconciling. He was freed on bail during the six months which elapsed before trial of the case at the York Assizes of 1786. At the trial his defence consisted partly in a plea that the evidence against him rested on the word of one witness only—the maidservant—and not the two required by law, and that the whole case was a malicious personal attack, and partly on the general grounds that the treason Statutes were obsolete and, in the conditions of 1786, unjust. The Judge in fact stopped the case and instructed the jury to return a verdict of not guilty. He did so as it became clear that there was only one witness, that she was clearly perjuring herself, and that the other evidence for the prosecution was beside the point. There is no doubt that the general plea of the

defence—in 1786—had much force; and it is interesting to speculate what the Judge would have done if there had been no legal flaws in the prosecution's case—doubtless Bolton would have been found guilty and then pardoned.

Ecclesiastical proceedings against Catholics passed through much the same gradual process towards desuetude. Presentments of recusants began to waver in Archiepiscopal visitations as early as 1684. After 1693 they seem only to have been made either generally as the result of special pressure by the Archbishop, or in some few places intermittently as the result of personal feeling—usually after conversions. In the Archdeaconry court of Richmondshire presentments followed the same path; but in the Archdeaconry of Cleveland they lasted fairly generally and strongly as late as the early 1740's before fading out. In the 1720's and 1730's there were even a few attempts at reviving ancient processes against Catholics. Thus in 1727 George Turner of Dalby was presented at the Archbishop's visitation as a Roman Catholic teaching a school without licence. It seems that the ecclesiastical court judge had him committed to gaol as unable to pay the fees of his prosecution. The man's neighbours petitioned the Earl of Carlisle. The Earl's agent at Castle Howard wrote to the Archbishop's Chancellor that his master thought the case 'very hard'. He pointed out that the fees were £8 and the man had not as many pence; the Chancellor should take half the fee and the local gentry would put up the money. This was done, and Turner released. It is interesting that he was not sent to the Assizes to face a civil charge—presumably because the Statute of William III imposing perpetual imprisonment on Catholic teachers excluded those only teaching the three 'Rs' or a trade. In 1735 a couple at Sheriff Hutton were summoned to the Cleveland Archdeaconry court to answer a charge that they had been married by Henry Kennet, the Catholic priest of Brandsby. They produced in court a copy of an entry in the New Malton parish register, to prove that they had also had an Anglican ceremony. The judge rejected their plea and counsel gave notice of appeal. The priest, Kennet, was then summoned to answer for his offence and he appeared by means of a proctor.

The outcome of the case does not appear. In 1738 an Oulston woman was brought into the same court, accused of conversion to the Church of Rome. She was enjoined to go to the Anglican church and certify regular attendance there in future. In 1740, again in the Archdeaconry court, a Whitby man was summoned for suspected conversion to popery and treated in the same way. John Rivett, the Catholic priest at Ugthorpe was, the same session, charged with running a school. A proctor appeared in Rivett's name to pay the costs of £1 7s., but the priest could not be found. These sporadic assaults seem to have been the last to be recorded in the court books.⁽⁷⁾

Meanwhile Parliament was, at fairly regular intervals, demanding of the Archbishops of York detailed information about Catholics in his province, numbers, increases, converts, gentry, schools, priests. Obviously the Quarter Sessions and Assize Judges were no longer in a position to supply the information. Thus special Archiepiscopal surveys were made, in 1706, 1733, 1735, 1743, 1766-7, 1780 and 1789. The earlier ones came when Archdeacons' courts were still eliciting fairly regular presentments and these could be made the basis of the returns. By 1733 the Archbishop was driven to relying on the distribution by his chaplains of printed questionnaires to all incumbents and thenceforward the surveys were mostly compiled from such sources. Much depended on the energy and views of incumbents. Where there was pluralism little precise information might be forthcoming. Where the squire was a Catholic, answers varied between great exactitude and very little. By the 1766-7 survey greater efforts were made to achieve completeness and Blackburne was now admirably placed (as both Archdeacon of Cleveland and rector of Richmond, the two greatest Catholic areas) to help—a task after his own heart. In a series of letters he advised the Archbishop shrewdly and gave him a shower of quite accurate information. For instance he knew that the Egton area was a place where converts were sent immediately after conversion, if their Protestant relations were troublesome. A lawyer friend had enlightened him on the real incomes of Catholic gentry and made the important point that

. . . there are very pretty estates in the hands of many Roman Catholicks of inferior rank which cannot be reckoned up without time and consideration, and they are purchasing every day without troubling themselves about the Law . . .

It emerges clearly from both Blackburne's letters and the Archbishop's notes that the policy of the Anglican authorities towards Catholics had, perforce, shifted its ground since the 1740's. There was no question now of prosecuting priests, although their names, places, ages and even personal characteristics were well-known to the authorities—or, at least, to Blackburne's informants. The great question was—were the priests 'quiet and peaceable', or 'busy'? The latter kind were to be got rid of—not by process of informations and the Assizes, or even by ecclesiastical court suits, but by private warnings given by the Archbishop in person to the Catholic gentry patrons. This was usually sufficient to secure the withdrawal of the priests from the county. Thus, in 1765, the Archbishop called Sir Henry Lawson of Brough to meet him at Brodswell, and there complained to him that the Brough chaplain, Fr Knatchbull, S.J., was too 'busy' and was making converts. Knatchbull was forthwith withdrawn from the mission by his superior. The same year Mr Cholmley of Brandsby was lectured by the Archbishop on (to use his own phrase) 'the prudence necessary in papists'. In 1729, in the same way, a Benedictine chaplain, Rokeby, was driven from Gilling, and the Hon. Charles Fairfax lectured on discretion—there had been a notable string of converts there. In 1753 the initiative came from elsewhere. The manor of Egton had been bought by a Protestant London goldsmith, Cary Elwes, who, on a first visit to his purchase, was very shocked to discover that he had bought a wasps' nest of papists. He forwarded to the Archbishop a most elaborate survey of the Catholic families amongst his tenants, remarked that he had instructed his agent in future to evict any tenant who became a Catholic, and called on the Archbishop to suppress 'so growing a Calamity'. This, and, no doubt the influence of Archdeacon Blackburne, led to a close Archiepiscopal interest in Egton for the next dozen years. But little could be done. The landlord was playing his part—but obviously could

not evict so large a proportion of his tenants—and it was the custom to charge papist parishioners extra fees for Anglican banns, marriages and funerals. The curate of Egton, Richard Robinson, received constant rebukes from his Archdeacon and Archbishop. He protested that he was compelled to hold Egton and Goathland parishes in plurality as the only way to make ends meet and ‘that I have done and still am doing everything which, in my present Circumstances, may be done towards the Amendment & Edification of the People committed to my Care. . . .’⁽⁸⁾

The Catholic Relief Acts of 1778 and 1791 were a natural consequence of this long and gradual change in the temper of public opinion, speeded on by the rise of Liberalism. The North Riding was a particularly fertile soil for Whig Liberalism—the Marquis of Rockingham had a residence at Malton, Edmund Burke was to occupy Malton Parliamentary seat (sustained during his election campaign there by gifts of game from the Gilling estate), and the Yorkshire Reform Movement was led by the Rev. Christopher Wyvill of Constable Burton (it was appropriate that this new head of the Wyvill family should also be a firm believer in legal toleration for Catholics). Meetings between the local Catholic gentry and the Whig leaders preceded the passage of the first Catholic Relief Bill of 1778. It was a very modest concession, repealing only three features of the penal code of the 1690’s—perpetual imprisonment for priests and teachers, the ban on Catholics buying or inheriting lands and buying lands forfeited by the attainders of 1715–6. The first of these concessions was conditional on the priests and teachers taking a new Oath of Allegiance at Quarter Sessions. In fact a large number of North Riding Catholics of every kind hastened to take the Oath as a demonstration of loyalty and a plea for further toleration, and a Catholic Committee of gentry was formed in London to negotiate with the Rockingham Whigs for further legislation. The formation of the Committee led to serious differences of opinion amongst Catholics. The more liberal amongst them, both gentry and priests (particularly Berington), urged that further concessions were unlikely until Catholics set their own house in

order and demonstrated by reforms that the Church was not the quintessence of obscurantism. The reform ideas aired by this school of thought included radical liturgical reforms (and a vernacular Mass), and a more democratic system of Church government where committees of gentry should be consulted by priests and Vicars Apostolic. Reform was, indeed, in the air. It was at this time that the bishops secured from Rome a modernisation of the medieval system of holidays of obligation and fasts which had prevailed in England hitherto. Another scheme dear to the Liberals was a reform of the colleges and schools and the establishment of a new type of Catholic Academy in England. The Vicars Apostolic and an increasing number of northern Catholic gentry became alarmed at the tone and nature of these liberal proposals. On 11 January 1780 Markaduke Tunstall of Wycliffe wrote to Simon Scrope of Danby on recent Catholic meetings in Yorkshire:

. . . The sence of the East Riding seems totally averse to the proposed address, but the meeting contained many clergymen and few men of property and originated with Mr Wyville . . . Catholic property, though now secured by law never probably was more likely to change hands than at present, there being scarce any extravagance or folly so absurd as has not its zealous votaries among our rising generation at least in the south . . . On 30 March 1784 Simon Scrope wrote from Danby to Mr Stapleton at Clints that he had no desire to take any new Oath for Catholics, even though Lord Fitzwilliam might be urging that they should do so. It was surely enough that Scrope and the other Catholics had already taken an Oath (that of 1778) to George III to defend him against all conspiracies and attempts against his person, throne and dignity. Scrope admitted that he had had difficulty in bringing himself to take that Oath, thinking 'conspiracies' altogether too strong a word and 'that last word' (? 'dignity') 'so strong that I can't get over it'. By 1787 the chosen representative of the northern gentry on the Catholic Committee, Sir John Lawson of Brough, led a conservative protest against the extremism of the Berington school of thought. He drew up a written protest, which was eventually signed by

fifty-one northern gentry, including the Withams of Cliffe. The protest took particular umbrage at the liberals' design of founding a new style of Academy in England to draw young Catholics away from Douai and the other colleges, which were regarded as narrow and outmoded. The conservatives reminded their opponents that persecution had not ended in the north (perhaps a reference to the recent Bolton case).

The second Relief Act of 1791 in effect repealed the bulk of the rest of the penal code for those Catholics who took an Oath of Allegiance. The Act allowed public Catholic worship and chapels, with certain humiliating restrictions. There were also certain positive prohibitions. Catholic religious might not teach the young in England and no endowments were to be given to schools and colleges. Catholics, Liberals and Conservatives drew diametrically opposite conclusions from these humiliations, but even Sir John Lawson had to write to a friend, on 22 June 1791, 'I congratulate with you upon our emancipation from the old popery laws'.⁽⁹⁾

The history of the North Riding Catholic missions of the eighteenth century is extremely complicated. Of the thirty-five missions in existence there at one time or another in the course of the century, fifteen were chaplaincies in gentry houses and existed throughout the period. In a good many of these successive squires chopped and changed a great deal between secular missionaries and religious of the various Orders. Thus Danby in Richmondshire, the Scrope house, was served in succession by secular priests, a Dominican, Jesuits and then Benedictines. In 1790 there were in the Riding eleven 'missionary districts', of which five (Stokesley, Angram, Oulston, Loftus, Linton) were former chaplaincies become districts on the extinction of the gentry family or the withdrawal of its support. The first four of the five were normally supplied by the priests of two other districts, Osmotherley and Ugthorpe. Two other districts, Scarborough and Richmond, arose naturally to meet the needs of an increasing Catholic population. Scarborough acquired a fund, given in a nucleus in about 1750 by a Crathorne resident. Whitby was served from Egton or Ugthorpe until 1794 when it first

acquired a resident priest and became a district. Another general feature of the missions was the gradual establishment of more unity and control by the bishop. We have already seen how the advent of Bishop Smith and the demise of the Old Chapter and Yorkshire association as governmental bodies much strengthened the hand of the Northern Vicar Apostolic in the 1690's. However, unity was still blocked by two factors—the almost total independence of the Vicar Apostolic's orders enjoyed by the regulars, and the great power of gentry patrons to make their own arrangements with priests directly. Between 1745 and 1753, after a brisk action in England and Rome, the Vicars Apostolic secured a respectable modicum of control over regular missionaries, who now definitely required the approval of the bishop and faculties from him before they could undertake a mission in his jurisdiction. The suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1778 had a variety of effects. The ex-Jesuits mostly remained in their places and came under the bishop as secular priests, so much reducing the proportions of the problem of the regulars. On the other hand the suppression dried up a very important source of missionaries—often men of distinction, the loss of whom the mission could ill afford—and undoubtedly made the working out of a profitable synthesis between the views of conservatives and liberals a much harder and slower business. The problem of relations with patrons was progressively eased, in its turn, by the rapid decline in the numbers of Catholic landed gentry and the rise of districts at the expense of chaplaincies. In the transition there were still difficult moments. In 1726–9 the Hon. Charles Fairfax insisted on importing to Gilling a Benedictine missionary chosen without consulting either the Benedictine Northern Provincial or the Vicar Apostolic. In the early 1730's the fourth Viscount Fauconberg quarrelled violently with several successive chaplains, chopping and changing between seculars and Benedictines. The ninth Lord Fairfax fought a long and stubborn battle with the Northern Benedictine Provincial in the 1750's and 1760's. This was crucial for the Benedictines then, since Fairfax was their principal lay support in the north. Fairfax—unrepentant after his affair in 1729 and unmoved by the Papal

Brief *Apostolicum Ministerium* of 1753—insisted that he must be final authority in the choice or dismissal of chaplains, that they must be limited to the service of his family following it wherever it went—to London, York, Scarborough—and subordinating their service of Catholics round Gilling to the interests of the family. As we have seen, in the 1690's the chaplains at Gilling had succeeded in setting up as many as two subordinate missions with their own priests, at Scawton and Helmsley. But the Fairfaxes refused to contribute adequately for the maintenance of these out-missions, local collections were insufficient, and the missions petered out by 1702. The Gilling chaplains were totally dependent on £20 a year stipend paid by Lord Fairfax, attempted to serve a vast area around Gilling as best they could, employing their neighbours as supplies when they had to follow the Fairfax family far from Gilling. In 1761 Lord Fairfax ejected the Benedictines and employed a Jesuit, Fr Jenkins. The arrangement only lasted until 1764, since Jenkins stoutly refused to travel with the family, temerarily suggesting that his people round Gilling needed him and that Lord Fairfax and his family, when in York, Scarborough or London, could go to the common chapels or even—in necessity—forgo 'Prayers'. (We ought, in fairness to Fairfax, to point out here that he always went to Mass daily.) The Jesuit was ejected and a new arrangement made with the Benedictines—really a surrender to Fairfax. Elsewhere the Vicars Apostolic gained ground on patrons—for instance at Wycliffe during their long residence there, and in the agreement with the Crathornes of 1742. In that agreement Ralph Crathorne endowed the Crathorne mission, and the fund and payment of the secular missionary (at the high rate of £30 a year) lay in the hands of the Vicar Apostolic, Dicconson.

For the most part the missionaries of this period remain for us merely lists of names in the roll of the missions. Here and there personal characteristics accidentally come to life in the records. The tradition that Catholic chaplains served also as estate agents is not borne out by Yorkshire evidence. At Everingham, East Riding, in the 1730's and 1740's, the Benedictine, Bede Potts, certainly acted as agent. But he was unique, and the arrangement

(which he detested and which obviously endangered his standing with tenant-parishioners) was simply due to the vagaries of his patron, who insisted on residing abroad and running the estate through very detailed fortnightly letters of instruction to Potts. The only other parallel to this in eighteenth-century Yorkshire was the position of Anselm Bolton at Gilling in the 1780's. Here again, the situation was peculiar. Bolton, as we have seen, was entrusted by the last Lord Fairfax with the care of his neurotic and helpless daughter after his death. There was a lay estate agent, and Bolton's task was really that of taking the place of a landlord. Apart from these cases, the ordinary missionary was either a house chaplain following his 'family' around, or a 'householder' resident in a cottage at the centre of a mission district. Both types of life offered peculiar difficulties. Common to both was the difficulty of underemployment—save perhaps in the extremely large districts of Egton-Ugthorpe and Richmond. A number of small schools run by missionaries appeared in the earlier part of the century; it is quite likely that these were started quite as much to keep priests occupied as to fulfil a general need. The Friars at Osmotherley ran a school in their house from c. 1700 to 1723. It was intended to be an 'apostolic school' to supply vocations to the Order, but in 1713-5 was said to have become merely a preparatory school for lay boys before they went to the Jesuit school at St Omer or the Benedictine school at Douai. It is true that it seems to have been conducted by a 'dame', Mrs Jenison, and the part taken by the Friar missionaries in teaching is obscure. In 1723 the school was moved from Osmotherley to the Midlands. At Ugthorpe the secular missionary, Monoux Hervey, started a similar preparatory school in about 1737. In 1745 he was said to have had ten pupils; but the school was broken up by his arrest in 1746. It is also possible that Fr Rokeby, the errant Benedictine missionary at Gilling in 1728-9, attempted to start a school there—he certainly was a man of large apostolic ideas and founded a school elsewhere later. There is little sign that missionaries occupied their time in scholarship. The English Benedictine General Chapter in the 1760's was seriously preoccupied with the problem of how to train monks

for the peculiar difficulties of the English mission. It thought that provision would be made best if monks were solidly trained in their monasteries to an exact and regular spiritual routine; they should be taught to study systematically, taking notes on the books they read (a practice which was certainly a great feature of Benedictine training at this period); and no monk should be sent on the mission until some years had elapsed after his ordination and his superiors were assured of his fitness for so solitary and peculiar a life. These were counsels of perfection, and there is little doubt that sloth and pettiness were the bane of missionaries' lives—or that a respectable proportion of missionaries of all kinds rose above that and lived many years of very regular and patient work in the depths of the country. The monastic library at Ampleforth still contains a good many of the books kept on the mission by Benedictines; from them it is possible to estimate the libraries on their shelves. The average monk missionary—for instance Bede Potts at Everingham and Anselm Bolton at Gilling—was no scholar, and had some fifteen or twenty books of a practical kind suited to his life and work—a *Summa* of St Thomas, a very few books of systematic dogmatic and moral theology, commentaries on Scripture for preaching, books of sermons, meditation books—and perhaps a ready-reckoner, a book on the care of horses or on gardening. But others had degrees in theology and had taught it in their monasteries. Fr Maurus Westbrook, a Gilling chaplain, was one of this sort, and his books included a good deal of theology and patristic texts. Gilbert Knowles, another Benedictine, was posted at Newburgh Priory from about 1710–3. In 1722 he wrote from another mission, Parlington in the West Riding, to Cuthbert Constable at Burton Constable, begging for a subscription to a book which he intended to have published—a *Materia Medica Botanica* of 5,000 Latin hexameters . . . 'I have another I call Phytologia just ready for the press. . . .' Constable filed the letter, noting on it in pencil, 'This poor monk went mad either with racking his brains with Poetry or drink or both and was sent to his monastery where he liv'd some time'.⁽¹⁰⁾

The mission had to endure at least one grave scandal. Peter

Adams *alias* Watson came to Osmotherley as a Franciscan missionary in 1727–8. In 1733–4 he apostatised—at least to the extent of ceasing to practice as a priest and by either taking a woman to live with him or going through a form of marriage. He refused to vacate the mission house and chapel and the Franciscan Guardian had to send another missionary to reside at Stay House, Over Silton (a Mass centre served from Osmotherley) and care for the stricken Catholic congregation. It appears that Adams in 1745 went to Newcastle, met John Wesley and invited him to Osmotherley. Wesley came and preached from the chapel window to a crowd below—the first of a number of visits. The friary and chapel were not recovered by the Franciscans until after 1755. The register of Monoux Hervey, the Ugthorpe missionary, notes that, on 5 June that year, ‘was reconciled to the Church by J. R. (his alias), mrs Ann Coulson of Billsdale by Stoxley, whom the fallen & Apostate Franciscan Fryer Watson of Osmotherley had perverted and deluded under pretence of Piety: But after three Years wandering she . . . returned to the Sheepfold of Jesus Christ. . . .’

Monoux Hervey’s register, in itself, is solid witness to his strong piety and hard work. His mission district stretched far beyond the bounds of Ugthorpe parish, to Whitby and Scarborough, and, on occasion almost to Stockton on Tees. In eleven years he received thirty-six persons into the Church. When in York Castle in 1746–7 he worked amongst the Jacobite prisoners, marrying two and receiving two others into the Church. We get the same impression of steady and conscientious pastoral work from other early registers—particularly of Richmond, Brough and Ulshaw Bridge—and from the incumbents’ returns of converts in 1766–7.

The average North Riding Catholic in this century cannot have been able to offer Mass more than once or twice a month—even if he lived close to a great Catholic house (since chaplains and their ‘families’ were so often absent). The Archbishop’s returns of 1735, 1743 and 1766–7 quite often note ‘Mass once in six weeks . . . once a month’. We presume that, as in the nineteenth century, the ordinary course on Sundays was Holy Communion

given at about 8 a.m., after which the communicants breakfasted and returned for Mass at about 10 a.m., to which Catholics came in from all directions. After Mass most stayed, dining with neighbours nearby, and sent their children for catechism, followed at about 2-3 p.m. by the rosary and evening prayers. The large house-chapels had a fuller liturgy than we might have expected. The ordinary household accounts of Gilling Castle throughout the century make provision for large quantities of church candles and incense, Requiem and Tenebrae candles, Holy Week books and prayer books. Of recent years there has been discovered at Newburgh Priory a monstrance—which can only have been in use there between 1700 and 1733. In 1792 Mrs Mary Tunstall bequeathed to the priest at Wycliffe, to remain perpetually in the chapel there, '2 Chalices, 2 Patines and small spoon; 1 Ciborium; 1 Expositorium; 2 Pixes; 6 Plated Candlesticks for the Altar; 1 Cruet plate; 2 cruets; 1 incense boat and spoon; 1 Thurible'.⁽¹¹⁾

The eighteenth century Catholic chapels of the Riding are very ill-documented. It seems clear that at first (usually in the sixteenth and most of the seventeenth century) they were sited in the attics of large houses. The 'Massing stuff' was generally kept concealed in chests and set out on each occasion. The Tankred family tradition is that the chapel at Brampton remained in the attics until the apostasy of the head of the family, the sale of the house and the demolition of parts of it, around 1778. But that was unusual—and probably due to the fact that the Tankred family most often resided at Givendale, Ripon between the 1660's and the mid-eighteenth century. In the later decades of the seventeenth century chapels tended to shift down from the attics to the first-floor—often with rebuilding to create a chapel block of rooms including a sacristy and priest's room, a permanent fitting. By the eighteenth century there often occurred a further shift, either to a ground floor room (sometimes with a door communicating directly with the outside of the house, for tenants coming to Mass), or, more boldly, to a separate chapel building erected either against the house or close by. Parallel with this third stage in great houses went a development in

'district' chapels. At first peripatetic missionaries said Mass in suitable rooms in manor or farm houses or cottages, carrying their 'Mass stuff' with them. In the eighteenth century (if not a little earlier in places), as mission districts took a more regular shape, it became usual for the priest to build, or buy and adapt, a 'Mass-house' which combined living quarters for himself (apparently often on the ground floor) and a permanently fitted chapel (on the first floor). In design these Mass-houses must have been exactly like cottages. Brandsby Hall was rebuilt by Francis Cholmley in 1767; thenceforward, at any rate, the chapel remained on the first floor of the Hall—it can still be identified there today. At Gilling Castle it is most likely (though far from certain) that the priest's room and chapel were somewhere on the first floor, no doubt until the extensive alterations and additions made by the ninth Viscount Fairfax between the 1740's and 1760's. Thereafter the chapel was on the ground floor at the end of the new South wing of the front. At Brough Hall the chapel seems to have been moved at one shift from the attics to a new chapel building expressly erected alongside the house—most likely in about 1740. This would coincide with the remarkable apostolic work there of Fr Knatchbull, S.J. At Newburgh we are almost totally in the dark about the position of the chapel. It was said, in 1735, to be 'an apartment' there—most possibly on the first floor. At Danby Hall, Richmondshire, the Scrope family tradition is that the chapel was on the ground floor—the present drawing-room. At Lartington, according to a statement in the later mission Register, a separate chapel was built (alongside the house?) in 1700. At Wycliffe, Cliffe, Aiskew Hall in Bedale, East Ness (Crathornes), Dalton, Aldborough, Loftus, Clints (bought by the Stapletons of Carlton in 1768) the chapels seem to have been inside the houses. At Yarm we are told in the middle of the century that the chapel was in the Friarage; and in 1791 the chaplain, Thomas Nandyke, registered at Quarter Sessions, in accordance with the Relief Act of that year, 'a certain Room commonly called the Chapel at the North End of the dwelling House of Edward Meynell Esq. at the Friarage'. Perhaps this would imply that the chapel was still in the house.

At North Kilvington the chapel must have been within the manor house. It was demolished in 1777 when Edward Meynell went to live on his newly inherited property at Yarm. The same year he started to build what must be substantially the present farm-house adjacent to the site of the old manor house. The farm-house was apparently designed expressly as a priest's house—though also meant to serve as a farm-house occupied by a tenant of the Kilvington home farm. It is very likely that, from 1777–8, this building took the shape it now has—with a chapel of two stories height incorporated into the back ground floor. From all sides the building appears to be a normal farm-house. At Ulshaw Bridge the Scropes built a Mass-house in 1788—the basis of the present house and chapel there. At Leyburn there was doubtless originally a chapel inside the manor house of the Waites and their heirs, the Thornboroughs. The Thornboroughs only seem to have lived intermittently there—which is perhaps why, in 1713, a presentment says that Mass was said in the house of Mr Sheppard in Leyburn for some forty Catholics. In 1791 the estate had passed by inheritance from the Thornboroughs to the Riddells of Northumberland. That year the chaplain at Leyburn registered at Quarter Sessions 'a part of the house of Ralph Riddle Esq. at Leyburn to the . . . use . . .' of a chapel. At Linton on Ouse the chapel was doubtless in the Applebys' house until the family died out in 1701. Hugh Appleby, by will, established a mission centre there with provision for a priest. There was certainly a Mass house somewhere in the village from 1702 for the rest of the century. In 1791 the priest registered the chapel as 'a certain part of my dwelling house at Linton. . . .' The same year the priest serving Aiskew registered a similar Mass-house there—perhaps an indication that the chapel in the manor house was no longer in use. At Whenby there was a chapel in the manor house until the house passed out of Catholic hands in 1716. The town was served by Benedictines until at least 1743. It seems that Mass was said in a cottage and that the missionaries eventually abandoned their intention of establishing a permanent Mass-house, as the Catholic population of the area dwindled away to nothing after 1743. At Crathorne there must have been

a chapel within the old manor house in the village street—now long demolished. In 1735 Mass was being said in 'William Passman's house' in the village—no doubt because the family was away at York or East Ness and the house shut up or even leased. We have no idea whether the establishment of a regular mission in 1742 implied restoring a permanent chapel in the house, or (perhaps more likely) setting up a Mass house apart from it. (The present chapel was built in 1810.)

It is likely that the present house and chapel at Osmotherley have stayed substantially unaltered since at least the early eighteenth century—with the chapel hidden on the top floor and approached by outsiders through the garden gate and up an outside staircase. At Richmond Mass must have been said originally in Catholic houses in the town. We have, as yet, no idea whatever of the date when a Mass house began—most probably early in the eighteenth century—nor of its relationship, if any, to the present chapel and site (built in 1806). At Scarborough Mass would be said in lodging houses until, in 1755, the Crathorne bequest founded a Mass house—where we do not yet know. In 1788 the priest's address was Low Conduit Street, in 1800 Westgate. At Egton we are entitled to imagine that Mass must originally have been said in the Salvin's manor house at Newbiggin and in cottages. 'Postgate's Mass house'—however far we carry modern scepticism about the discoveries there—may well represent the fact that the next stage in development (especially considering the size of the congregation) by the 1670's was some sort of Mass house. Perhaps the idea was abandoned after 1680. Certainly the priests after then seem to have lived at the Bridge House with the Smiths. At least by 1743 a chapel existed on the side of the Bridge House and in 1795 it was disused and a larger one built nearby—the immediate ancestor of the modern church. The history of chapel development at Ugthorpe is even more obscure—except that we know that a 'new' chapel or Mass house was built in 1767–8. At Stokesley Mass would be said first in the Fosters' house. We should have expected that their Catholic successors, the Piersons, would have continued this house chapel. Perhaps they did. But in 1735 it was reported that

Mass was being said by visiting priests in a weaver's house. Yet the 1743 incumbent's report mentioned a sizeable Mass house maintained by Mr Pierson—that same separate building which was demolished by a mob in 1746. From 1747 the Piersons' sway faded out; the Mass house cannot have been replaced and Mass must have been said in private houses by visiting priests until a mission was re-established in 1860. At Whitby Mass was no doubt said by a visiting priest occasionally in Mr Smith's hired house in 1736-7, but no Mass house existed until the mission was founded in 1794. In 1792 a short-lived manor-house chapel existed at Greenbury, Catterick Bridge, for the benefit of the Wright family of Kelvedon, Essex, staying there. Mass must have been said monthly in various private houses in Helmsley throughout the century—for some decades in the house of a barber, Mr Richard Kendall. A house chapel was maintained by the Coates family at Stay House, Over Silton, from at least 1710 to the 1760's, and in Easingwold Rectory manor by the Salvins for some years in the early part of the century. Lastly there were, from the 1730's, two cottage Mass houses intermittently in use at Oulston and Angram, both near Coxwold.

The cumulative effect of this mass of fact and speculation must at least make it very clear that even in 1792 there were no architectural splendours in Catholic life in the Riding; no single chapel can have looked like one from outside; few could have held as many as a hundred of the faithful at once; very few have survived to our day recognisably.⁽¹²⁾

The first sixty years of the century saw no diminution in the steady flow of women's religious vocations—but after 1760 the flow dried up almost completely. This fact requires investigation and was doubtless connected somehow with both the governmental Enlightened assault on religious houses after 1760 on the Continent and the penetration amongst the rising generation of English Catholics (perhaps even women and certainly their fathers and brothers) of those liberal 'follies' which Mr Tunstall remarked on in 1784 and which the last Lord Fairfax had bewailed as early as 1760-1. Up to 1760 some forty-five women from the Riding were professed abroad in English convents. We can

detect the continuing force of convent schools and aunts in religion. There were four Withams, three Maires, three Meynells, four Tankreds, three Lawsons, two Bellasises, two Smithsons, three Smiths of Egton, a Scrope. But that is very far from telling us the whole story. Some of these entered austere Orders which had no schools—the three Smiths the Poor Clares of Rouen, a Witham and two Maires the Poor Clares of Dunkirk, a Douglas from Yarm the Carmelites of Hoogstraet, two Tunstalls the Bridgettines. Comparatively few girls entering religion came from outside the close circle of gentry—Mary Moore of Loftus (Bruges Franciscans), Mary Busby of Yarm (Brussels Dominicans) Mary Metcalfe of North Otterington (the Bar Convent), Mary Anderson of Richmond (Bruges), Scholastica Addison (? East Harlsey)—the Cambrai Benedictines.

In 1702 there seem to have been some 2,200 Catholics in the Riding; in 1767–80 there were, according to the Archbishops, 2,620. No significant change took place in the general distribution of Catholics, if we consider the proportions of the total to be found in each wapentake. Richmondshire and Cleveland retained their considerable predominance. But in general, although Catholics remained extraordinarily widely distributed, there was a significant tendency towards concentration in some fifteen to twenty centres. Thus in Richmondshire—in Hang West the great majority came to be concentrated round Catterick (100) and Bedale (80–90), while numbers at Masham and Patrick Brompton fell away steeply; in Hallikeld there were very few Catholics anyway; in Gilling East the Manfield (Cliffe) area (100) came to dominate the rest; in Gilling West the process of concentration was still very slow. There were substantial congregations at Wycliffe-Hutton Magna (110), Easby (50), Forcett (45), Kirkby Ravensworth (40), Marske (20), while Romaldkirk (39 to 20) and Stanwick (59 to 12) were in decline. In Hang East the concentration was at Wensley (106–80), Grinton (42) and Thornton Steward-West Witton-Spennithorne (43), while East Witton was fast declining and the Aysgarth congregation near extinction. As in most towns, the Catholic population of Richmond was fast increasing (1700: 15; 1766: 40; 1780: 90). In Cleveland concen-

tration centred on Egton–Glaisdale–Danby–Lythe (1700: 290; 1769: 320; 1780: 415), Crathorne (1700: 30; 1766: 94; 1780: 88), Yarm (1700: 40; 1766: 108; 1780: 120). There were still small stable congregations at places like Hinderwell, Loftus, Brotton, Skelton, Carlton, Appleton Wiske, Snainton, but others were in full decline—Stokesley (1670: 105; 1700: 54; 1766: 68; 1780: 21), Hutton Rudby (1700: 30; 1766: 25; 1780: 13), Hilton (1670: 33; 1700: 17; 1766: 5; 1780: 4), Whorlton (1766: 16; 1780: 4). Not surprisingly the congregation at Whitby was increasing steadily—1604: 97; 1670: 36; 1700: 54; 1766: 74; 1780: 100. There were, as usual, very few Catholics in Pickering Lythe—Pickering, with its 6 or 7, was an exception to the usual run in towns. In Birdforth there was a heavy concentration on Coxwold (1700: 6; 1735: 123; 1766: 97; 1780: 83) and the town of Thirsk (1700: a dozen; 1766: 62; 1780: 86), and in Bulmer at Brandsby–Stearsby (40), Linton (33) and Easingwold (1700: nil; 1766: 5; 1780: 24). In Ryedale the concentration was on Gilling–Scawton–Helmsley (1700: 74; 1766: 101; 1780: 67) and Hovingham (45), while Malton and Kirkdale were declining. Lastly, in Allertonshire the centres were now Leake (1700: 50; 1766: 68; 1780: 62), Northallerton town (1700: 35; 1766: 32; 1780: 52), Osmotherley (1700: 9; 1766: 25; 1780: 33), while Thornton–Kilvington (1670: 60; 1700: 42; 1766: 35; 1780: 15), North Otterington and Birkby were fast declining. Scarborough in 1780 still only had a Catholic permanent congregation of 24, headed by William Langdale, George Crathorne, Baron Fischar (a Swiss nobleman) and his valet. The popularity of the Spa there dated from the 1650's. The first evidence we have discovered of Catholic gentry taking the waters is of Sir Philip Constable of Everingham in the East Riding, who was there in the seasons of 1695 and 1698. In 1733–4 we have the evidence of a printed list of genteel visitors, subscribers to the Spa and Library, and of Cuthbert Constable's correspondence books. The Long Room was then run by a Frenchman, 'Mons Vipont', and the theatre occupied by Kerregan's company; the visitors included Sir Francis Anderton, Bt., Mr Constable, Thomas Charlton, Esq., St John Charlton,

Esq., Mr Collingwood, Mr Eyre, Henry Eyre, Cuthbert Fenwick, Dr Ferrari, Jean Louis Faure, Richard Fitzherbert, Thomas Hesketh, Esq., Lord Langdale, Bradshaw Pierson, Esq., of Stokesley, Francis Revell, Thomas Salvin, William Tempest, John Tempest, Francis Veracini, Gilbert Walmesley, Esq., Miss C. Brockholes, Lady Clavering, Miss Clavering, Miss Collingwood, Mrs Dillon, Margaret Fitzherbert, Lady Swinburne, Mrs Tancred, Miss Tancred, Mrs Tempest. In May 1730 Sir Marmaduke Constable had written to his Catholic friend, Mr Brigham of Wyton—‘You will have a great deal of company at Scarborough this next season from these parts. Dr Mead now much approving of those waters in severall cases. . . .’ In 1764 the Jesuit chaplain at Gilling noted that the congregation at East Ness would be on his hands for a time, since the chaplain there, Mr Barrow, was ‘this morning as I hear gone to Scarborough. . . .’ About the same time the York doctors advised the Hon. Anne Fairfax to take the waters at Scarborough. In September 1784 Stephen Walter Tempest, the Catholic squire of Broughton Hall, Skipton, died suddenly ‘in the rooms at Scarborough’. In July 1788 William Maxwell Constable of Everingham wrote from Scarborough—‘Sir John Lawson & family are here, Jack Lawson, your friend Gehegan, your brother Charles (Constable) . . . we remain here until York races. . . .’ Thus, through most of the eighteenth century, what with visiting Catholic gentry, their servants, chaplains, foreign Catholic cooks, impresarios and actors, the seasonal Catholic congregation must often have swelled to over a hundred.⁽¹³⁾

The rise in Catholic numbers, as the Archbishop dimly realised in 1766–7, concealed a sharp decrease in the relative strength of Catholicism in Yorkshire, since it fell far below the striking contemporary increase in the general population. To judge from the census of 1801 the total population of the Riding in 1780 (when there were 2,620 Catholics) must have been about 150,000. Even in the unique Egton–Glaisdale–Lythe area the 415 Catholics were part of a total population of about 2,700. The Archbishop therefore took comfort—rather dubiously—in the thought that Catholic strength was dwindling. His survey of Catholic gentry certainly pointed to a very rapid shrinking in

their ranks since 1700—a fact which was lamented by the last Lord Fairfax in 1761. However, an examination of the Catholic gentry of the Riding in this century seems to show firstly that the decline of the gentry was by no means so catastrophic as these witnesses thought, and secondly that the decline was, to a notable extent, offset by the operation of other factors.

As we have seen, there were some sixty Catholic gentry families in the Riding in 1702—as against the 120 of the 1620's and 109 of 1642. In 1770–80 there were some 25–7, apart from a dozen other genteel sojourners from elsewhere. In Gilling West there were the Tunstalls, Maires, Stapletons of Clints, Dents of Marrick, Aspinwalls of Aldborough; in Gilling East the Saltmarshes and Withams; in Hang East the Stapletons of Bedale and Lawsons; in Hallikeld the Tankreds (to about 1778); in Hang West the Scropes, Allens and Thornboroughs. In Birdforth there were the Bellasises (some of them), and Pinckneys of Thirsk. In Ryedale were the Fairfaxes, the Bullocks of South Holme and Bullocks of Muscoats; in Bulmer the Cholmleys of Brandsby and Hardwicks of Cornbrough. In Allertonshire were the Meynells, and in Cleveland the Crathornes, Smiths of Egton, Fermors of Yarm, Langdales of Scarborough and Gage Oliveres of Lythe. How had the rest fallen? There were two clear and resounding apostasies in the course of the century. The first in importance was undoubtedly that of the fourth Viscount Fauconberg in 1734. The years of full Catholicism at Newburgh Priory, from 1700 to 1734, were mostly marked by quarrels and troubles. The third Viscount quarrelled with a succession of chaplains, ran into money troubles (in spite of his great landed wealth) and died a fugitive from his creditors in the guesthouse of the English Benedictine convent at Brussels in 1718. His eldest son, the fourth Viscount, had been educated in unusual seclusion, with the heir to the Gascoignes, in the minute apostolic school of the English Benedictine community at Dieulouard in Lorraine. He set out vigorously to pull the family's affairs into order and made an advantageous Catholic marriage, which promised eventually to bring him large estates in Staffordshire in the right of his wife. But then everything turned sour for him. His mother

and various other members of the family contested his allotment of the property, carrying the case into the courts with much violence and publicity. He accused his mother of wild extravagance and his father's Catholic lawyer, Nicholas Mayes of the Friarage, Yarm, of abetting her. The mother told a story of her husband's inability to cope with the stream of affluence which had descended on him in 1700. No sooner was this distressing affair settled than the Fowler case began. Catholic society was kept agog for years by this. No sooner had Fauconberg got his hands on his wife's Staffordshire inheritance (he intended to change his family name to Fowler to help on the acquisition), than other heirs appeared and put the matter to the courts, which divided the inheritance between the (Catholic) claimants. At the height of this affair, Fauconberg was still acting as the leader of Yorkshire Catholics in negotiations to clear the air after a Protestant rumpus caused by the conversion of a vicar of Kippax in about 1730. In 1734 he apostatised, was received into the established Church, was given a commemorative Bible by the King and eventually raised to an Earldom. But the consequences of his apostasy were curious. It seems that he cleared out priest and chapel from Newburgh. Yet, although his heir was brought up a Protestant, his own wife and daughters remained strong Catholics—the latter all married Catholics. Chapels for the Catholic tenants were established by the daughters of Angram and Oulston nearby. Fauconberg cannot have raged much against his considerable number of Catholic tenants—the number did decrease after 1734, but remained quite large thereafter. He himself remained on very friendly terms with the Fairfaxes, and when he died in 1774 it is extremely likely that he was reconciled to the Church. His successor, though a Protestant, had a host of Bellasis relations who were Catholics, and on his death without male heirs in 1802 the Viscounty—but not the estate—passed to these Catholics, and the last Viscount was actually a Catholic priest.⁽¹⁴⁾

The second apostasy was that of Sir Hugh Smithson of Stanwick. He conformed to the Church of England in 1711 and became a North Riding Justice in 1714. However, his Langdale wife seems

to have remained a Catholic, the majority of his children were Catholics and three of his daughters later became nuns. It was his grandson (born in 1715) who later was created Duke of Northumberland. Sir Hugh, like Fauconberg, was not ostracised by his Catholic friends and served on occasion as their trustee—for instance to William Witham of Cliffe in 1723. It is true that the number of Catholics in Stanwick declined after 1711, but it did so gradually—it is unlikely that the family lived there very much. It is possible that there was a third case of apostasy—of Sir Thomas Tankred of Brampton. The family was noted for its piety, and two of his sisters were Benedictine nuns. In 1776 he married, became a Freemason and sold all of his estates rapidly, leaving the country for the Continent. His Catholic widowed mother and one of his sisters continued to live at Fulford, near York. His wife appears to have been a Catholic in 1784, but his descendants were Protestant. This case must have provided evidence for the conservative Catholics, like Marmaduke Tunstall and Lord Fairfax, who lamented the follies of the rising generation. Fairfax had already been guardian to the young and wealthy Catholic, Sir Thomas Gascoigne of Parlington, who apostatised on coming of age. Nor were these the only cases. Fairfax had broken off his daughter's engagement to the Catholic William Constable of Burton Constable, gravely suspecting the young man's faith. In fact Constable plunged into Deism and died out of the Church.⁽¹⁵⁾

The troubled end of the Moore family of Loftus and Angram possibly also involved apostasy by the last male heir. The domestic affairs of the family were dragged through the York ecclesiastical courts in 1719–22. Zachary Steward Moore, the head of the family, was, like his forebears, a lawyer of Gray's Inn, though a Catholic. His wife, a convert, seems, by 1718, to have conceived a passionate repugnance for her husband and everything Catholic, and after much drama (with wild accusations that Catholics were—headed by Dr Witham, the Northern Vicar Apostolic, a friend of the family—bent on poisoning her), she quitted her husband and apostatised. Shortly afterwards both Zachary and most of the other Catholic members of the family died and Loftus passed to

a dissolute heir who sold it and vanished into obscurity. The end of the Pierson family—also Catholic lawyers—of Stokesley is ill-documented. It seems that, in the 1730's, the estate passed to the sole survivor of the family, a daughter, who married an Italian and they sold the estate in 1741 and moved away.⁽¹⁶⁾

But the end of the great majority of the vanished gentry families was far less dramatic. A number ended in heiresses—the Meynells of Dalton and Aldborough in 1749, the Mayes of Yarm about the same date, the Crofts of Appleton by 1740, the Salvins of Easingwold—not finally until 1794. Other families let their estates and moved away—for instance the Liddells of Newsham, the Andersons of Gayles, the Allens of Thornton Steward, the Franklands of Downholme, the Pinckneys of Silton, the Pudseys of Pickton, the Middletons of Middleton on Leaven. Other families became steadily more impoverished and sold their lands—the Thwings of Heworth (who had sold their last rights there by 1740), the Metcalfes of Tanton in Stokesley, the Stricklands of Catterick and Richmond (by 1782).

The first of the factors which offset this decline of the gentry was that in many cases such families, and even their estates, were not protestantised. We have already several times noted that it is unwise to assume that the sale of an estate, the apostasy of the head of a family, or even the vanishing of a Catholic family from recusancy presentments in their home area, mean that they became Protestants as a whole. There are many cases to indicate the extraordinary power of survival of Catholicism. When we last noted the Percehays of Ryton, we had every reason to assume that they had got Catholicism out of their system by the 1660's, and they are certainly unknown to presentments after that. Yet Henry Maire, the lawyer-genealogist, noted that Barbara, the 'sole daughter and Heiress of Christopher Percehay Esqre. of Ryton in Yorks. by his wife a sister of Sr Tho. Tankard of Brampton bart.; ob. 1755; bur. at St Pancras aet. 75' married the Catholic Thomas William Selby of Biddleston, Northumberland. Their children were Catholics and married Meynells and Lawsons. We have already noted the survival of Catholic Rokebys in the 1680's. In 1723 William Witham of Cliffe left

a small bequest to 'my poor cousin Ralph Rokeby'. The Andersons of Gayles, Franklands of Downholme and Binks of Bedale left their homes to live in Richmond town, where we lose sight of them by the 1750's. The Allens of Thornton Steward, much impoverished, moved to Leyburn in 1740 and were still gentry there in 1791. The Smithsons of Newsham appeared in various other places in the 1690's and reappear in Hutton Magna in 1717-20—identified by their registration of the remnant of the Newsham lands. The Forsters, originally of Durham and then Gilling in Richmondshire in 1717, reappear at Yarm from 1731. The Aspinwalls of Forcett moved by 1728 to Stanwick and were still there in the 1750's. The Belwoods of Lythe moved early in the century several times, ending at Stearsby. The Metcalfes of Tanton seem mostly to have moved to London. The last Lord Fairfax often stayed there at the house of his close friend, Roger Metcalfe, surgeon, of Brownlow Street, a son of the last owner of Tanton, and a Catholic. The Pudseys of Pickton moved thence to Co. Durham where they registered Pickton lands in 1724. The Middletons of Middleton on Leaven moved to Hutton Rudby and were there to 1723. Even where Catholic gentry families died out, their estates often remained in Catholic hands. The eighteenth century Riding was dotted with estates which had passed to Stonors, Tempests, Petres, Middletons of Stockeld in this way. The register of papists' estates contains other surprises—such as the fact that the manor and castle of Slingsby were owned by a London Catholic in 1717, or that lands in Ampleforth and Oswaldkirk belonged to Staffordshire Catholics in 1723.

The other mitigating factor was an apparent increase in the numbers and wealth of the local Catholic middle class. As we have seen, Archdeacon Blackburne's lawyer friend had remarked on this. As the long and extraordinary predominance in the Catholic body of landed, armigerous gentry was—more slowly than we perhaps once thought—passing away, the future leadership fell increasingly to prosperous freeholders, tradesmen and professional men. It is noteworthy that the surviving Catholic gentry contained a high proportion who took to business or the law. Amongst lawyers were the Moores, Piersons, Lawsons (with

sidelines in banking and mining), Mayes, Maires, Withams, Pigotts. We left the Scropes of Danby in 1702 poised on the edge of bankruptcy, owing to ill-managed lead-mining ventures. In 1699 Simon Scrope was £9,000 in debt, 'his household goods and moveable estate actually seized by his creditors and his wife and children left destitute of maintenance'. In 1714 a private Act broke the entail on his Nottinghamshire estates, which were sold to pay debts to Catholic friends (Sir Hugh Smithson, Mr Messenger, Mr Curwen, Mr Stanfield, Mr Charles Tankred). Scrope's heir, another Simon, seems to have set the family on its feet again financially, partly by economies, partly by successful horse-breeding (the Scrope racing colours had much success at Newmarket and Hambleton and York), partly by a marriage in 1749 to one of the three Meynell of Dalton heiresses. One of Simon's sons, Henry Joseph, was apprenticed to a Leghorn merchant. A daughter of the Cholmleys of Brandsby ran a successful millinery business in York in the 1760's, while her brother, Francis, had been agent at Gilling. The widow of James Fermor of Yarm married 'William Carr of York, architect'. The Withams, besides engaging in the Law and medicine, were much intermarried with the family of Thomas Langdale, a rich Catholic distiller of Holborn. The last Lord Fairfax had a sister married to the lawyer son of the conveyancer, Nathaniel Pigott. Fairfax also had one nephew apprenticed in York and another an apothecary in Drury Lane. The Brighams of Carlton Miniott had a nephew an apothecary at Aberford. The Crathornes of Ness—like the Langdales of Houghton—had a relative in the shipping business. Even the fourth Viscount Fauconberg had one cousin, Anthony Bellasis, a merchant in Leghorn, and another a lay tutor in Catholic noblemen's families. Service in foreign armies did not attract the North Riding gentry—we have only found two cases, William Fairfax and Thomas Salvin of Easingwold, both 'officers in the Imperial Service'.⁽¹⁷⁾

The Catholic middle class was headed by professional men. Thomas Douglas was an attorney at Yarm (with an apothecary brother and Bishop son); Catholic doctors increased in numbers (Nicholas Bourgeois, surgeon at Crayke and Thirsk; Drs James

Pringle and James Burchall at Richmond; Mr Bourn, surgeon at Helmsley; Francis Wilson, surgeon at Aysgarth). As Catholicism now began to take root in towns, we meet far more Catholic merchants and tradesmen (the Heddons, mercers of Bedale; the Dinmores, bridlemakers and farmers of Thirsk; Edward Thwing, coal-merchant of York; John Rickaby, linen-manufacturer of Crathorne; the Redheads, mercers of Scarborough; Mr William Cottrell, peruke-maker, John Loveday, bookseller, both of Scarborough; John Reynoldson, grocer, and Christopher Dent, fellmonger, of Leyburn; Mr Douglas, apothecary, William Grayson, draper, Thomas Hutchinson, dyer, William Morgan, land-steward, Joshua Smith and John Greyston, merchants, all of Yarm; Stephen Atkinson, Joseph Harrison, Mr Crathorne, Richard Wardal, master-mariners of Whitby; Clement Symson, shopkeeper of Stokesley—these are random examples). There were those prosperous freeholders and graziers, like the Radcliffes of Stearsby, the Sturdys of Scawton and Farlington, the Liptrots of Scawton, Bates of Appleton Wiske, Shaws of Thoresby, Aysgarth, Keartons of Muker, Ingrams and Tophams of Middleham, Bells of Wensley, Coates of East Witton, Mouldens of West Witton, Mitchells of Coxwold, Hunts of Linton, Pearts of Stokesley, Fearbys of Crathorne, Harrisons of Glaisdale, Hodgsons of Ugthorpe, Hardwicks of Sheriff Hutton. There was a mobility and enterprise about some of these families. In 1734 the Hodgsons of Ugthorpe had one daughter in London (married to a tradesman in St Clement Danes), a son (John Hodgson, peruke-maker) at St Paul's, Covent Garden, another (Cuthbert Hodgson, gent.) in Whitby, and others at Stockton and Bell House, Essex. The Dales of Ugthorpe had a son at Ingatestone, Essex. The Kendalls of Helmsley had children in York and London. The Metcalfes of Aysgarth had tradesmen sons in York. The Hardwicks of Hovingham and Sheriff Hutton had Northumberland and London connections. Jordan Sturdy, farmer of Farlington, had one son in trade in York and another at Callaley in Northumberland. The Dinmores of Thirsk had two children (one an upholsterer) in London. The careers of the Ullathornes, Joseph Holdforth and the Winpears illustrate the same mobility. Arch-

bishop Ullathorne's pedigree passes, on his convert father's side, from Ripon yeomen, through a schoolmaster, a vicar of Ampleforth, and a general dealer in Easingwold, Everingham, Pocklington and Scarborough, and, on his mother's side, from a marriage between William Binks, freeholder of Forcett and Easingwold and Anne, daughter of Christopher Cresacre More of Barnborough. In the decades after 1790 the Archbishop's relations were to prosper in business at Barnard Castle. The Holdforths were Catholic labourers at Gilling. One moved to York, and his family long acted as housekeepers to the priests of the York secular chapel. Another, James Holdforth, settled in Helmsley. A great flood in 1754 demolished his house and killed all of his family except his wife and infant youngest child, Joseph. Joseph was brought up at Gilling, apprenticed in Whitby, moved to Leeds and there made good in business. He became a great benefactor of Catholic chapels in and around Leeds and the founder of a family of early Victorian upper middle-class respectability. Charles Winspear of Danby End (possibly no Catholic, though his family later certainly were Catholics) passed through Whitby trade to London in 1704. His son, David, settled as a merchant in the English commercial colony at Leghorn; his son was General Antonio Winspear of the army of the Bourbon kingdom, and his son, in turn, a Baron of the kingdom, serving King Joachim Murat.⁽¹⁸⁾

In 1790-1 the prospects for North Riding Catholicism were mixed. The period of the great Parliamentary enclosures had begun—a great threat to the existence of the Catholic freeholder class. The North Riding was long to remain devoid of great towns and industry (more than half a century was to elapse before Middlesbrough ceased abruptly to be a hamlet with a much-decayed Anglican chapel and no Catholics). The Catholic landed gentry were in full decline. The French Revolution had already broken out, and Catholic colleges, schools and convents on the Continent were about to be ejected. The fact that the decline of the gentry was somewhat less marked in the North Riding than elsewhere in Yorkshire, that the middle class showed vigour—these were faint lights on a very sombre background.

Notes

(1) *RH*, 6, i, p. 13ff. Walter Tankred of Brampton and William Tunstall of Wycliffe were pardoned for their parts in the 1715 Rising (Lawson-Tancred, cit.; Kirk, p. 237)

(2) Hornyhold-Strickland, cit.; *YAJ*, 6/173. An example of sentimental Jacobitism is Elizabeth Tankard's will, Jan. 1765: '... my great Medall of King James . . . in a silver Box', used to touch for the King's Evil (Tankard MSS, Leeds Dioc. Archives).

(3) *NRRO*, Extra Recusancy MSS; *STA*, B/2.

(4) Stephens, op. cit.; *NRRO*, cit.

(5) W. R. Ward, *the English Land Tax in the Eighteenth Century*, 1953; Rowlands, cit.; Wombwell MSS.

(6) *RH*, 6, i/14ff; *PRO*, C/2449/12ff. (Fairfax v. Robinson); *BI*, PAA/185 (Tankard).

(7) Kirk, cit.; J. Graves, *History of Cleveland*, 1808, pp. 226-7 (Stokesley); Bolton MSS, Ampleforth Abbey; *CRS*, 14 (Hervey); *R*. VI. B/4; F/2 (Turner, etc.).

(8) *BI*, R.Bp.H.2/9 (Blackburne); 5/242-3, 273, 277 (Egton); *RH*, 6, ii/101.

(9) B. Ward, *Dawn of Catholic Emancipation*; Scrope and Lawson MSS, cit.

(10) Dugdale MSS, *NRRO* (Crathorne); Wombwell MSS, Kirk and Lawson-Tancred, cit.

(11) Franciscan archives, cit.; J. Wesley, *Journal*; *CRS*, 14/374 (Hervey); *RH*, 6, ii (Fairfax); Hogarth, i/504ff. (Wycliffe).

(12) Chapels—*VCHNR*; Trappes-Lomax MSS, *CRS* Library; *NRRO*, Chapel Registrations, 1791; Lawson MSS, cit.; Hogarth; Allanson, cit.; *PRO*, Catholic registers.

(13) Scarborough—*STA*, Box 14 (Spa); Everingham MSS, cit.; *A Journey from London to Scarborough*, 1734; Burton Constable MSS, Beverley City Records Office; Wombwell MSS, cit.; *BI*, R.Bp.2/11.

(14) Wombwell MSS, cit.; Birmingham Archdiocesan Archives, *passim* (Fowler case); Kirk.

(15) Smithson—G. Brenan, *The House of Percy*, ii/43off.; *CRS*, 14/139. Tankred—Lawson-Tancred, cit.; *RH*, 6, i, *passim* (Fairfax).

(16) *BI*, *R*. VII. I/699.

(17) *NRRO*, Reg. of Papists' Estates; Scrope MSS, cit.; *RH*, 6, i (Cholmley); Lawson MSS. Robert Carr of Horbury, W. Riding,

father of the celebrated architect, John Carr, in 1721 married Rose Lascells, daughter of John Lascells, gent., of Norton le Clay, N. Riding, at 'North Kilvington'—where there was only a Catholic chapel and no Anglican church (York Public Lib., MSS Y.929.I). The Tankreds of Brampton had Tankred cousins, drapers, in London in the mid-eighteenth century (Lancs. Cty Record Office, O'Hagan MSS, DDTo/Q.14).

(18) Ullathorne—NRRO, cit.; G. E. Mingay, *English Landed Society in the Eighteenth Century*, 1964; B. L. Kentish, *Chronicles of an Ancient Yorks Family*, 1963. Holdforth—ed. J. McDonnell, *History of Helmsley and District*, 1962; Waugh, *History of Leeds Mission; Ampleforth Journal*, ix (1904), pp. 395–6. Winspear—information from Count G. Winspear of Naples, 1955.

Appendix I

The Incidence of Catholic Recusancy in the North Riding to 1790

MS Sources

1. *Records of the Diocese of York* (Borthwick Institute, York)

A. Comperta or Court Books of Archiepiscopal Visitations. R. VI. A/1ff., a series from Sept. 1561. The notable gaps are 1604, 1611, 1693-1712. Covers all peculiars except Archdeaonry of Richmond.

B. Comperta of Special Archiepiscopal Enquiries. Fragments only surviving—Bodleian Tanner MS, 8ff., 28ff. (1676, Richmondshire omitted); CRS, xxxii, pp. 204ff., and Trappes-Lomax MSS, CRS Library (1706); *ibid.* (fragments of 1729-33); CRS, xxxii, pp. 204ff. (1735); YASRS, lxxi ff. (1743); BI, R.Bp.b. (1764); *ibid.* 2/8 and 9 (1767); 2/11 (1780).

C. Comperta and Court Books of Archdeacons of Cleveland. Do not include the Durham and Pickering Peculiars. Only R.H/21 (1585); R. VI. C/26, 27 (1632, 1634); C/34 (1640-1); C/35-6, B/8, C/37ff. (1701-49).

D. Cause and Precedent Papers. Casual survivals, of which some 50-60 relate to recusants.

E. Chancery Court Books. 1570-1640, occasional references; little in series from 1670.

2. *Records of the Diocese of Chester* (Archdeaonry of Richmond)

A. in the Borthwick Institute, York. R. VI. A/7 and 8 (1578); A/11 (1590); A/12 (1594); A/14(i), 15 (1630); A/22-3 (1633); A/29 (1669-70).

B. in Leeds Central Library, Archives Dept. RD/A. 1ff. (Arch. of Richd. Consistory Ct. Act. Bks., 1577-88, fragments 1589-1605, entire 1609-34, 1637-8, 1641, 1665ff.); RD/AC. 1ff. (Cause Papers); RD/C. 1ff. (Visitation Ct Bks., 1663ff.); RD/CB. (Churchwardens'

presentments—8 is odd ones 1577-18C; 11 is 1766-7 return of Papists, of which a copy in YAS Library, Leeds MS, 724); RD/RU. (survey of 1716-24).

C. Chester County Record Office. Not seen. Some Visitn. Bks., Papist returns 1789, 1811. Chester High Comm. Bks. 1562-73.

3. *York High Commission Court* (Borthwick Institute)

Court Books 1561-1641; the only notable gap is April 1603 to Jan. 1606/7.

4. *Ecclesiastical Peculiar Courts in North Riding*

A. Masham Peculiar.

i. Leeds Central Library, Archives—RD/M (Court Bk., 1618-41, mostly in print in J. Fisher, *op. cit.*, Court and Register Bk., 1585-1650's, Reg. Bk., 1639ff.

ii. *YAJ*, xxxiv, pp. 48ff. Visitn. presentments, 1741-87.

B. Durham Peculiars, Allertonshire and Crayke. Borthwick—R. VI. C/X (Allertonshire Correction Bk. 1671) ? others at Durham.

C. Middleham Peculiar. Borthwick—R. VI. C/X (Correction Bk. 1663-6, 1671).

D. Peculiars of Dean and Prebendaries of York. Only *YAJ*, xviii, pp. 197ff., 313ff. (Pickering 1568-1602); York Minster Library, Visitation Records (1590ff.).

5. *Marginal Places*

A. Parishes of Scarborough, Hackness, Seamer, E. Ayton and chapelry of Harwood Dale lay in the East Riding Deanery of Dickering. See East Riding Archdeaconry Bks. (R. VI. D/1ff.).

B. Parish of Sockburn—township of Sockburn and house of Conyers family lay over the Tees in Durham; the rest in York diocese.

C. Heworth lay partly in North Riding Deanery of Bulmer and partly in York Deanery.

6. *Assize Court Records*

PRO, ASS. 41-7—N.E. Circuit Assize records; bits printed in SS, xl.

7. *Recusant Rolls*

PRO, E.377/1ff., 1592 to 1689, little used here. See also sheriffs' quittances in local records—e.g. in NRRO, Hutton MSS and Stapylton of Myton MSS.

8. *Northern Commissioners for Compounding with Recusants*

Documents 1627-32 printed in CRS, liii.

9. *Committees for Sequestrations* (Interregnum)

CCC; YCA, E/63 (Bk. of Orders, etc., of Yorks Committee, 1645ff.).

10. *North Riding Quarter Sessions*

A. Quarter Sessions records. *NRRO*, Minutes and Orders Bks., 1605ff., Bks., of Recusants Indicted 1611, 1614; 1616-29, 1630-41; Miscell. Recusancy MSS 1690-1745; Register of Papists' Estates and Deeds, 1717ff.; Bonds for Registrations; Warrant to arrest Papist gentry, 1690; 1745, Papists' original bonds (c. 192).

B. Special Enquiries about North Riding Recusants, through JP's. *CRS*, liii, pp. 15ff. (1595, from Cecil Papers, Hatfield); J. Peacock, *Roman Caths. in Yorks, 1604* (from Bodleian Rawlinson MS, B/452); *CRS*, vi, pp. 75ff. (1663-71, from *BM.*, Add. MS 20739).

11. *Special Civil Jurisdictions in North Riding*

A. Scarborough (Town Records, Town Hall, Scarborough, well catalogued). Quarter Sessions records (scattered through Boxes 1, 2, 16, 17); Common Hall Minutes and Orders, 1623ff. (Boxes 1, 2); Criminal Informations (Box 23, 17C); General Letters (Boxes 6, 7). Little of recusant interest elsewhere.

B. Richmond (Town records, Town Hall and Town Clerk's Office). *QS* Bks. lost (see C. Clarkson *Hist. of Richmond*, 1821, who used them).

C. Others—Allertonshire, Pickering Lythe (J. C. Atkinson, *North Riding Records, NS.*), Whitby Strand, Hackness (*YASRS*), Middleham—only had probate powers, return of writs, custody of wrecks, and perhaps petty civil jurisdiction.

12. *Middlesex County Records*

Ed. J. C. Jeaffreson, vols. ii and iii, convictions of some North Riding recusants there, 1604-47.

13. *Anglican Parish Registers*

With details of recusants—Stokesley, Gilling, Hackness, Kirkby Hill (all printed by *Yorks. Par. Reg. Soc.*); Stainton (transcript at *NRRO*), Brandsby, Egton and no doubt others.

14. *Catholic Mission Registers*

A. at *PRO*—Lartington (from 1769, RG. 4/3470), Wycliffe (1764, 4/2390, 3662, 3663, 4466), Cliffe (1792, 4/4057), Angram (1771, 4/84), Osmotherley (1795, *ibid.*), Brough (1758, 4/3459, 2635, 3440), Crathorne (1777, 4/3152), Clints (1786, 4/3404), Richmond (1748, 4/2194, 3659, 2751, 2816), Whitby (1794, 4/3707), Yarm (1795, 4/2376, 2813). Also, not seen, Aiskew (1812), Brandsby (1820), Danby (1742, printed in *CRS*); Crayke-Easingwold (1819, but from 1794 at Presbytery, Easingwold), Egton Bridge (1835, but *CRS*, xiv, pp. 313ff.; 1734-45 from a *West. Archives MS*), Leyburn-Danby (1806),

Linton (1771, printed in CRS), N. Kilvington (1775), Ugthorpe (MSS from 1781 at Presbytery).

B. *Lost?*—Gilling Castle, Newburgh-Oulston, Brampton.

15. *Subsidy Rolls*

PRO, E. 179/214/39off. North Riding 1626-42 with rects and non-cts.

(1) RYDALE WAPENTAKE

Ampleforth 1594-5 2 non-cts. 1615-27 2 rects. 1627-32 1. 1633-7 4 popish rects. 1680 1 papist. 1690-1706 2. 1733-5 6-8. 1745 3 families. 1764 1 family. 1780 10.

Appleton le Street 1571 1. 1586 2-3 rects. 1590-6 2 rects, 2 non-cts. 1600-7 1 non-ct. (Raysins). 1621-33 4 rects. 1633-7 4. 1641 2. 1682-90 1 papist. 1706-33 nil. 1735-43 3 papists, poor. 1764-80 nil.

Barton le Street 1586-95 1 rect. 1596-1600 2. 1604-5 7 rects. (Marm. Beckwith and wife, Barbara wife of Rich. Gower). 1619-27 4 non-cts. (Tho. Gray Esq., Geo Ridley gent). 1690 2 papists. 1706-67 nil. 1780 4 papists.

Great Edston 1576 Geo. Simpson gent non-ct. 1706-80 nil.

Gilling 1569 Nic. Fairfax rebel, Sir Nic. Fairfax, Wm. Fairfax suspects. 1586 1 non-ct. 1590 Thos. Fairfax non-ct. 1600 Kath. wife of Tho. Fairfax Esq. rect. 1604-12 2 rects. (Rose Rosse gen'), 2 non-cts. 1614-9 4 rects. (Lady Kath. Fairfax, Mrs Rosse, Mrs Dakins) 1623-30 8 rects. (Rosse family) 1634-41 8 rects. (Thos Visct Fairfax and wife, Ralph Salvin Esq. and wife, Rosses) 1654-5 4. (Visct Fairfax and wife, Salvins, Rosse) 1663-7 20 papists (Visct Fairfax, Simpson gent, Ann Malham gen') 1676 25. 1685-90 32. (Visct Fairfax, Mrs Garnett) 1704-6 48 papists. (Fairfaxes, Robt Yorke) 1733 27. 1735 43. (Fairfaxes, Allen Ayscough, Mr Mainman, Mr Stourton) 1767 49. 1780 35.

Helmsley 1575 1 rect Bilsdale. 1582 2 rects (Mr Layton and wife), 2 non-cts. 1590 Mr Layton and wife rects, Jn Crosland gent, Ralph Percy and another non-cts. 1594-7 12 non-cts. (Jn Crosland and wife, Thwaites family) 1599-1603 5 rects. (Cecilia Percy) 1607-14 10. (Chris. Baine gent, Edw Eyre and wife, Tho Lowick gent and wife, vid. Lowick) 1615-20 10. (Mich Earneley gent and wife) 1626-9 Crathorne Ashley gent and wife, Eliz wife of Peter Swales gent, Rich Pullein gent and wife. 1631 Francis, Earl of Rutland and Countess. 1633-42 22

papists. (Earneley, Swales, Crathorne) 1663-7 25 papists. (Thos Thwing gent, Swales, Ashleys, Rich Kirke gent and wife) 1674 27. 1690 34. (Kirkcs, Croslands) 1706 38 papists. 1733-5 32. (Mr Bourn surgeon, Robt Dolman gent and wife) 1743 c. 32. 1764-5 papists 7 families and part of 6 others. 1767 44 papists. 1780 22.

Hovingham 1580 Geo Holtby gent rect. 1590-2 24 rectx. (Holtby) 1594-5 13 rectx, 2 non-ctx. (Bullock, Holtby) 1600 19 rectx. (Holtby, Wildons, Bullocks) 1603-4 36. 1607 32. (Crathornes) 1612 30. (Crathorne, Bullock, Holtby, Lascelles, Nendykes gents) 1619 Thos Worsley gent and wife, Chris Aske gent. 1623 27 obstinate rectx. (Worsleys, Askes, Bullocks) 1624 40. 1641 40. (Worsleys, Holtbys, Crathornes, Bullocks) 1667 43 papists. (Crathornes, Bullocks) 1685 24. 1690 36. (Bullocks) 1704-6 34 papists. (Crathornes, Bullocks) 1733-5 40. (Crathorne, Bullock) 1743 11 families papists. 1764-7 44 papists. 1780 44.

Kirkby Moorside 1569 Chris. Neville Esq and 114 others rebels. 1591 4 rectx (Hy Bulmer gent and wife of Keldholme), 1 non-ctx. 1594-6 1 rect, 2 non-ctx. 1605-7 1 rect at Gillamoor, 1 non-ctx. 1618-23 5 rectx. (Gillamoor) 1627 same. 1632 4 rectx. (Mrs Nendyke) 1641 2 rectx, 1 non-ctx. 1663-84 many Quakers. 1690 John Bell papist. Farndale Jane Turner papist. 1705-6 John Bell. 1735 5 papists. (Chris. Sturdy innkeeper and wife) 1743 2 papist families. 1764-5 9 papists served by priest at Ness. 1767 8.

Kirkdale 1578 1 papist. 1582-6 3-4 non-ctx. 1594-1600 1 rect, Ralph Hurst gent non-ctx. 1604-7 6 rectx. (Lanc. Bullock gent and wife of Muscoats) 1615-26 9 papists. (Hursts of Sonley Cote, Bullocks) 1628-9 same with Nendykes of Wombleton. 1632 12. 1641 6. (Bullocks) 1663-7 7 papists. (Bullocks, Thos Thwing gent) 1674 2. (Bullock) 1690 2. 1706 1. 1733-5 5. (Bullocks) 1743 1 papist family. 1764-80 nil.

Lastingham 1590 4 non-ctx. 1604 same. (Wm Turner of Rosedale) 1607-11 Turner and children obstinate rectx. 1 other rect. 1612-5 same, 5-6 rectx. Wm Turner capper to York Castle for refusing Oath of Alleg. 1623-4 3 rectx (Turner), Helen wife of Fras Rokeby non-ctx. 1632-4 4. (Turner, Eltofts) 1663 Margt. Turner. 1690 Jane Turner of Farndale papist. 1706 1 papist. 1735-80 nil returns.

Malton 1582 Jn Raysin rect, 3 non-ctx. 1592-5 Alice wife of Jn Watson gent rect, 3 non-ctx. 1600-7 2-3 non-ctx. 1618 Lord Eure papist. 1619-21 Kath Appleby rect. 1622-7 8-10 rectx, 2 non-ctx.

1637-8 12 rects. (Eures, Wm Ireland Esq, Robt Goodrick gent, Wm Gascoigne) 1641 42. (Eures, Mich Earneley gent and wife, Eliz Yorke, Wm Garstang gent, Marm Thorpe gent) 1663-7 19 papists. (Nendikes) 1674-6 24. 1690 13 papists. 1706 14. 1733-5 11. 1764-7 5. 1780 4 papists. (Thackrey, Alland, Wright).

Normanby 1611-2 1 rect. 1614 Robt Lascelles gent and wife. 1641 2 papists.

Nunnington 1580 Robt Ealand Esq and family rects. 1627-37 non-cts. 1674-85 2 papists. 1690 7. 1704-6 9. 1722 1. 1733-5 8. (Lord Widdrington) 1743 2 families. 1764-5 12 papists. 1780 7.

Oswaldkirk 1615 2 non-cts. 1623-34 2-4 rects. (Holtby) 1637-40 2-3 rects. 1663-60 1 family. 1685 Taylor family papists. 1690 same. 1706 4. 1735-43 nil. 1764 1. 1780 1 papist.

Salton 1627-74 odd non-cts. 1706 1 papist. 1735-65 nil. 1767 1. 1780 nil.

Scawton 1569 rebels. 1615 1 rect. 1624-5 4 rects. (Sturdy) 1632 Sturdys. 1636-41 4. 1667 9 papists. (Sturdy) 1690 16. (14 Sturdys) 1733-5 8 Sturdys. 1743 3 families. 1743 same. 1764-7 8 papists. 1780 10.

Slingsby 1586 1 non-ct. 1637 3 non-cts. 1680-5 1 papist. 1704-6 1. 1733-80 nil.

Stonegrave 1580 Thornton and Butler fams. rects. Wrights of Lays-
thorpe rects. 1586-93 Mrs Wright, Mrs Thornton. 1600-7 3-5 rects.
(Thorntons) 1619 10. (Thorntons, Ann wife of Wm Ashley gent)
1623-30 4. 1637-41 3. 1682-5 nil. 1690 1. 1704-6 7 popish rects.
1715-35 butcher and fam. of W. Ness papists. 1743 1 fam. 1764 same.
1780 nil.

(2) BULMER WAPENTAKE

Alne 1569 rebels. 1590 1 non-ct. 1600 1 rect. 1609 1. 1614 1 rect,
2 non-cts. 1623 2 at Tollerton. 1681 1 rect. 1690 4 papists. 1735 1 fam.
at Tollerton. 1743-5 3. 1764 3 fams. and 2 single men papists. 1780
24 papists. (Chapman, Moorey, Stott, Brown).

Bossall 1575 Fras Copendale Esq rect; 2 non-cts. (Mr Thwaites)
1586 Mrs Darley. 1690-1 Mr Darley and wife rects, Isabel Hungate
non-ct. 1600 2. (Fairfax, Hungate) 1604 3. (same) 1605-11 Mrs
Fairfax rect. 1613-41 2-3 rects (Allansons, Fairfax) 1667 Peter

Pudesy gent papist. 1676 nil. 1706 1. 1735 2 papists. 1743-65 nil. 1780 3.

Brafferton 1581-96 1-2 rects. (Mrs Eliz Thynne) 1613 9. (Rich Cholmley Esq and wife, Thomasin Gower vid.) 1622 3. (Gervase Strickland gent) 1623-7 22 rects. (Stricklands, Cholmleys, Sir Wm Webb and wife) 1630-6 8. (Tho Franke gent and wife, Mrs Robertes) 1655 Lady Mary Howard. 1674 8. (Sir Tho Strickland, Jn Grimston and wife) 1690 2. 1706 6 papists. 1725-9 2. (Mrs Butler) 1733-5 1. 1743 nil. 1765 3. 1780 1 family.

Brandsby 1590-5 10-15 rects. (Cholmleys, Vauxes) 1600-2 same. 1604-5 20. 1614 12. (Cholmleys) 1623-8 43 rects. (Chs., Thwings) 1641 38 rects. 1663 46 (Cholmleys, Wm Fairfax gent) 1674 61. 1676 60. 1690 45. (Cholmley) 1733 57. 1743 10 families papists. 1764 6 fams. (Cholmley) 1767 31 papists. 1780 36. (Cholmley).

Bulmer 1575 1 non-ct. 1580 c. 20 rects. (Milburnes) 1594-5 Bern. Mawde gent rect. 1604 Tho Hungate gent and wife non-cts. 1607 2 rects, 3 non-cts. (Tho Milburne gent) 1611-6 7. (Wm Rosse gent) 1623-4 4. 1627 Tho Milburne non-ct. 1641 3. 1667 6 papists. 1674-6 6. 1690 1 family. 1706 1. 1735 2. 1743 nil. 1764-5 1 family. 1780 2 papists.

Crambe 1580 1 rect. 1586-1. 1607 1. 1631-6 Hilary Beverley gent rect. 1663-82 some papists. 1706, 1735 nil. 1743 1. 1764-7 nil. 1780 2 papists.

Crayke 1581 1 rect. 1663-82 ? several. 1690 nil. 1706 nil. 1733-5 4 papists (Mr Nic. Bourgeois surgeon) 1743, 1767 no returns. 1780 16 papists.

Dalby 1582 2 non-cts. 1586-90 2 rects. (Lady Eliz Dineley), 2 non-cts. 1595 7 rects. (Wm Courser gent and wife) 1605-6 Kath Dutton vid. rect. 1611 5 rects. 1621-3 5. (Mrs Nendyke) 1628-9 Tho Nendike gent and son. 1632-40 7. (Nendikes) 1641 7 (Allen Ayscough gent and wife) 1644 Geo Nendike and Allen Ayscough gents papists. 1663-7 25. (Ayscoughs) 1674-6 16. (same) 1690 11. (same) 1706 24 papists. 1733-5 8. 1743 6. 1767-80 nil returns.

Easingwold 1569 rebels. 1591 2 rects. 1595 3 rects, 1 non-ct. 1600 1. 1604 1. 1612 1 rect. 1615 1 rect, 2 non-cts. 1616-25 1 rect. 1667-82 no returns. 1706 2 papists. (Wm Salvin gent) 1716 5 Salvins. 1743 3 papist fams. 1764-5 5. 1780 24 papists.

Foston 1590 2 non-cts. 1676 1 papist. 1706-35 nil. 1743 1 papist. 1764-80 nil.

Haxby 1580 2 fams. rectx. 1590 1 non-ct. 1604 1 non-ct. 1706-35 nil. 1764-80 nil.

Helmsley, Gate and Upper 1569 Jn Thwing gent rebel. 1596 1 non-ct. 1592 Ingram Thwing gent rect. 1706-67 nil. 1780 Gate Helmsley 4 papists.

Heworth 1582-5 Kath Thwing rect. 1590-5 2 Thwings. 1604 Mrs Thwing rect. 1614-6 3. 1619 2 Thwings. 1622-3 5 rectx. 1624-5 12. (Thwings, Ann Layton gen', Tho Metham gent and wife) 1631-2 3. 1637-41 7-9 rectx. (Thwings, Wildons) 1644-5 Mary Ward and companions. 1663-7 6-7. (Thwings, Lady Stapleton, Lanc Bullock) 1669-75 same. 1677-82 8-9. (Thwings, Sir Walter Vavasour, Mrs Lascelles, Mrs Dolman) 1690 12 papists (Thwing, Bullock) 1706 Wm Thwing. 1716-7 same, 2 other rectx. 1743-4 1. 1745 2. 1743-80 no returns.

Holtby 1690-1733 nil. 1735 1 papist. 1764-80 nil.

Huntington 1577 10 rectx. (Mrs Foster, Mrs Agar, Holme fam.) 1582 13. (Agars, Holmes, Mrs Ursula Wright) 1586 14. 1590 16. (Fosters) 1592-5 9 rectx, 2 non-ctxs. 1600 8 rectx. (Foster) 1602 Seth Holme gent. 1604 9 rectx, 2 non-ctxs. 1607 7. (Foster, Holme) 1612-16 5. (Foster) 1624-5 5. (Jn Donnington gent) 1641 2. (Agar) 1690, 1706 nil. 1733-5 1. 1743 1 fam. papists. 1765 same. 1780 5 papists.

Huttons Ambo 1581 Edw Gower gent rect. 1600 Fras Fairfax and wife non-ctxs. 1604 Mrs Fairfax non-ct. 1638 2 (Nendikes) 1641 2. (same) 1676 5 papists. 1693 1. 1733-67 nil. 1780 2 papists.

Marton and Moxby 1595 1 rect. 1632-7 2. (Edw Barton gent and wife) 1641 same. 1652 same. 1667 Alice Barton papist. 1674 5 (Bartons) 1682 3 (same) 1706 4. 1735 4. 1743 2. 1764ff. nil.

Myton on Swale 1569 rebels. 1572-5 2 rectx. (Chris Bayne gent) 1578-82 4-6 rectx. 1663-90 ? 1706-80 nil.

Newton on Ouse 1582 1 rect. 1590 3. 1615 1 non-ct. 1633-4 2. (Applebys) 1637 3. (same) 1652 Thos Appleby gent. 1667 4. (Applebys) 1674-82 12-6 papists. (Applebys, Ric Gascoigne, Wm Hall gent) 1706 35. 1733-5 22 papists. 1743 9 fams. 1764 11 fam. 1765 25. 1780 33.

Osbaldwick 1633-7 3-4 rectx. 1690, 1706-35 nil. 1743 1 fam. 1764 same. 1765-80 ?.

Overton 1572-80 3 rectx. (Beseleys) 1586-8 Mrs Nelson rect. 1590-5 4-5. (Beseleys) 1600 2 rectx, 2 non-ctxs (Beseley) 1604 5. 1606-8 2.

(Nelson) 1610-2 10. (Beseleys) 1614 3 rectx, 3 non-ctx (Nelsons) 1623 5 non-ctx. 1676 1 papist. 1706-80 nil.

Sheriff Hutton 1577 Sir Edw Gower and wife rectx. 1592 6 rect ladies in Castle. 1604 1 rect. 1611-6 2-3 rectx. (Mrs Robertes) 1623-34 4-5 rectx. (Bartons) 1641 14. (Bartons, Joan Rokeby vid., John Rokeby) 1663 2 papists. 1676 10. 1690 9. 1706 14. 1733-5 14. (Ursula Frankland vid.) 1743 1 fam. 1764-5 3. 1780 4 papists.

Stillington 1569 rebels. 1578 1 papist. 1582-6 2. 1633-7 1-2 papists. 1706-33 nil. 1735 3 papists. 1743 2. 1764 nil. 1780 11 papists.

Stockton on Forest 1615 2 non-ctx. 1690-1780 nil.

Stensall 1577-8 5 rectx. 1590 2. 1596 1 rect, 1 non-ctx. 1600 1 rect. 1604 3 rectx. 1615 1 non-ctx. 1706 1 papist. 1733-80 nil.

Sutton on Forest 1575-8 1 rect. 1580 5. 1582-6 3-5. 1590-6 2-3. 1600-4 1-2. 1606-7 3. 1615 2 rectx. 1622-3 2. 1627-9 5 (Mr Donnington) 1637-41 5-6. 1690 1 papist. 1706 4. 1735 2. 1743 nil. 1764 1 at Huby. 1780 4 papists.

Terrington 1569-70 1 rect. 1580-1 16-8 rectx. (The Wildon gent, Ric Vavasour gent, Fras Metham Esq and family) 1586-7. (Methams, Wildons) 1590-3 same. 1595-8 8. (same) 1600-4 4-5. (Wildons) 1615 2 non-ctx. 1617 Mrs Metham rect. 1619-27 3. (same) 1632-41 5. (same) 1663-90 ?. 1706 3 papists. 1733-5 1. 1743-67 nil. 1780 1 boy papist.

Thormanby 1569 rebels. 1765 1 poor old woman papist.

Warthill nil.

Whenby 1580 Barton family rectx. 1586-96 Mrs Barton. 1612-6 3. (Mrs Barton) 1626-9 10-1. (Bartons) 1641 same. 1665 11 papists. (Barton) 1667 16. 1674 18. (Wm Walworth gent) 1676 22. 1690 16. (Walworths) 1706 37 papists. (Walworths) 1733-5 5. 1743 nil. 1764 2.

Wiggington 1595 1 rect. 1716 1 papist. 1735-43 1. 1764-5 nil. 1780 1 papist.

(3) BIRDFORTH WAPENTAKE

Old Byland 1590 Mr Layton and wife rectx. 1616 1 rect. 1625 1. 1627, 1637 1. 1641 2. 1743 2 papists.

Cowesby 1624-41 2-4 rectx. 1663-7 2 papists. 1671-4 same. 1690-1780 nil.

Coxwold 1585 1 rect. 1590 2 non-cts. (Mrs Readshaw) 1592-3 4 rectx. 1596 4 non-cts. 1599-1600 3 rectx. 1612-3 2. 1615 Sir Thos Bellasis. 1627 2 rectx, 1 non-ct. 1633-41 3 rectx. 1652 Visct Fauconberg papist. 1662-3 3 rectx. 1667 4-5. (Mrs Thomlinson) 1674 13 rectx. (Tho Thomlinson gent) 1680-2 2-3. (Thomlinsons) 1690 6. (same) 1701 7 papists. (Moores) 1733-5 123 papists. (Bellasises, Moores) 1743 8 fams. 1765 13-4 fams. of papists. 1767 97 papists. 1780 83.

East Harlsey 1569 Leon Dacre Esq rebel. 1585 5 rectx. (Wilson) 1590 3. 1592-5 1-2. (Wilson) 1596-1600 same. 1605-12 2-3. (Wilsons) 1615 4. (Grange, Wilson) 1623 4 rectx, 3 non-cts. (same) 1628 11. (Wilson, Bowes, Best) 1629-41 8. (Addison, Grange, Wilson) 1674 8-9. (Granges) 1682-4 4. (same) 1690 12 papists. (Helen Grange) 1706 nil. 1733-5 1. 1743-80 no papists.

Hawnby 1571 Roger Meynell gent rect. 1577 Cuth. Meynell. 1580-1 M. family. 1586 M. and Tankard families. 1600 Wm Meynell Esq rect. 1604 2 rectx. 1607 4. (Meynells) 1611 2. 1612-4 20 rectx. (Meynells, Bowes) 1615-6 same. 1624-5 4. 1631-4 Mich Earneley gent and wife rectx, 1 non-ct. 1641 1 non-ct. 1663 3 rectx. (Frances Meynell) 1667 2. 1674-6 6. 1680 5. 1685 4 papists. 1706 7. 1716 5. 1735 4. 1743 1 fam. 1764-5 same. 1780 5 papists.

Husthwaite 1633 Marg. Killinghall papist. 1706 nil. 1743 2 fams. 1764 7 families of papists. 1780 6 papists.

South Kilvington 1582 1 rect. 1586 Jn Bowes and wife non-cts. 1590 18 rectx. (Jos. Constable Esq and wife, Bowes) 1592-3 11. 1594-6 16. (Bowes) 1600 18. (Bowes) 1607 22. (Bowes) 1611-2 15. (Jos. Constable gent and wife, Bowes) 1613-5 16. (Lady Constable) 1624 23. 1632 28. 1635-8 10-12. 1639 14. (Thos Meynell gent and wife, Mrs Ireland) 1641 30. (Meynells) 1667 21 papists. (Jane Grimston) 1674-6 12. 1680-2 13. 1690 24. (Jn Pinckney gent and wife) 1701-5 25 papists. 1706 20. 1733-5 36. 1743 12 fams. 1764-5 8-10 families. 1780 Kilvington 9, Thornbrough 6, Upsall 3.

Cold Kirkby 1623 1 non-ct. 1690, 1743 nil. 1764 nil. 1767 some papists. 1780 4.

Kirkby Knowle 1569 Jn Fulthorpe Esq rebel. 1592-3 Jos. Constable gent and wife. 1594-5 21 rectx. (Mich Yorke, Wm Danby) 1600 21 rectx, 3 non-cts. 1607 12. (Mrs Constable) 1611 29. 1616 same with Thos Crathorne gent, Jane Ingleby, Jn Lascelles, Ralph Neville gent.

1623 33 rectx (same with Lanc Brand gent, Chris Conyers gent), 3 non-cts. 1627-8 46. 1632 36. (Wm Frankland gent) 1641 29. 1663 10 papists. 1667 9. 1674-6 7-10. (Fras Hunt gent and wife) 1690 6. 1705-6 2. 1733 7 at Boltby. 1743 2 fams. 1767 nil. 1780 1 papist.

Kilburn 1582 Gilbt Metcalfe gent rect. 1586 4 non-cts. (Metcalfes, Isabel Stapleton) 1590-6 3 rectx, 1 non-ct. (Metcalfes) 1606-7 3. (same) 1612-5 6 Metcalfes. 1621-3 5. 1627 4 Metcalfes. 1632-7 5. (Wm. Rosse gent) 1641 3. (Rosses) 1663 Mary wife of Tho Thornton gent. 1674-6 2. 1701 10. 1706 15 papists. 1733-5 12. 1743-5 2. 1764 2. 1765 3 families. (12 persons) 1780 11 papists.

South Otterington 1581 The Talbot gent and family rectx. 1590 1. 1601 Ann Talbot. 1604 5. (same) 1611-2 2. 1615 4. 1619-23 4. 1627 2. 1632 4. (Ric Talbot gent) 1633-7 2-3. 1641 2. 1667 4 papists. 1674-6 2-3 Bulmers. 1682 2. 1690, 1706 nil. 1735 1. 1743 1.

Over Silton 1562 Chris Lepton gent rect. 1586 3 rectx. 1607 1 rect, 2 non-cts. (Eliz Clapton, Wm Best) 1611-2 4-5. (Peter Wycliffe gent and wife, Ric Ascough Esq) 1613-4 Ascoughs. 1615-7 2. (Mrs Wycliffe, Mrs Coates) 1619-23 2. 1626-7 2-4. 1629 Chris Pinckney gent. 1630-2 3. 1634 Mrs Ann Lepton, Coates family. 1638-41 10-2. (Pinckney, Coates) 1667 10. (Coates) 1674 c. 22. 1682 10. (Pinckney) 1701-14 11. (Pinckney, Coates) 1735 11 papists. (Coates, Mr Jenison) 1743 3 fams. 1764 4 fams. 1765 25. 1780 10.

Sutton under Whitestone Cliff 1581 Wm Harrington gent and family. 1592-3 6-8 rectx. (Lawrence Brand and family) 1594-6 1. 1598-9 Harringtons. 1600 3. 1605-6 3. (Harringtons) 1607 12. (Brands) 1615 6. (same) 1623 3. 1632-4 11. 1637-41 5-7. 1663-7 8-9 papists. 1674-6 8. 1701-6 5-6. 1733-5 7. 1743 3 fams. 1764-5 2-3 fams. 1780 9 papists.

Thirkelby and Osgodby 1569 Fras Fulthorpe gent rebel. 1595 1 rect. 1600 1. 1614 1. 1632-3 2-3. 1634-41 1-2. 1674-6 nil.

Thirsk 1561-2 Chris Lascelles gent suspect. 1569 centre of rebellion. 1571 6 men suspect, 1 gaoled. 1572 2 rectx gaoled. 1575-6 3 rectx. 1582 Fras Fulthorpe gent rect. 1590 2 rectx. 1595-6 2. 1599-1600 6. 1606 9. (Mrs Lockwood, Danbys, Mrs Nelson) 1615 5. (Lanc. Brand) 1623 14 rectx. (Lockwood) 1624-8 same. (Nelsons) 1633-6 Fras Bainbridge gent. 1637-41 6-7. (Lockwood) 1667 14-8 papists. (Lockwood) 1674-6 20. (same) 1690 7. 1701-6 13-4. (Dinmores) 1733-5 39. (Mr Nic Bourgeois surgeon, Mr Wm Pinckney attorney) 1743 19 papist fams. 1765 50. 1767 62. 1780 Thirsk 68. Sowerby 18.

Topcliffe 1569 Tho Hussey gent, Tho Exilby, Fras Norton gents and c.135 men rebels. 1571 1 rect gaoled. 1580 Jn Greene Esq and fam. rectx. 1590 Mrs Yorke. 1596 5. (Isaac Gibson gent) 1600 8. (Wm Ingleby Esq and fam., Mrs Malham) 1615 3. 1624 3. 1630 3. (Mr Garnett) 1682 3. 1690 2 papists. 1706 2. 1733-5 11. 1743 7-8. 1764-80 nil.

Welbury 1569 Benet Cholmley gent and 13 others rebels. 1595 3 non-ctx. 1596 2 rectx. (Lowicks) 1600 1. 1605 Robt Bowes gent. 1607 3. (Bowes) 1615 4. 1627 3. 1633 Tho Bowes gent. 1632-41 2-3. 1663 6. (Methams, Applebys) 1690-1706 ?. 1733-65 nil. 1780 3.

(4) PICKERING LYTHER

Allerston 1573 1 rect. 1602 Robt Leeming gent non-ctx.

Brompton 1590-3 Fairfaxes. 1606 1. 1611 1 rect. 1641 Mrs Smith rect. 1666 Tho Smith gent. 1674 5. (Smiths) 1676 nil. 1690 2 papists.

Cayton 1607-8 Hy Beilby gent rect. 1630 Wm Beilby. 1632 Wm Wyvill gent. 1633 Wm Beilby gent papist. 1633-7 2. 1663 2 non-ctx.

Ebberston 1592 1 rect. 1594 1. 1637 2 papists.

Ellerburn 1590 1 rect, 1 non-ctx. 1623-4 Mrs Wiles. 1634 1 rect. 1639 2. (Wiles) 1640 3 rectx. (Wiles) 1663 1 papist. 1667 2. 1706-80 nil returns.

Hutton Bushel 1586-90 Marg. Conyers rect. 2 non-ctx. 1607 2 rectx. 1733 1 papist. 1735 3. 1744 1. 1764-7 nil.

Kirkby Misperton 1590 Wm Percehay Esq rect, 3 non-ctx. 1624-6 Tho Percehay Esq rect. 1630-2 Marm Raysin rect. 2 non-ctx. 1636-7 2 rectx. 1663 Chris Percehay Esq and son and 3 others non-ctx. 1706 nil. 1743-67 nil. 1780 6 papists.

Levisham 1619 2 rectx. 1676, 1706 nil. 1735-67 nil.

Middleton 1595 2 rectx, 2 non-ctx. (Robt Lascelles and wife) 1600 2 non-ctx. 1620 Jas Hebburne gent and wife rectx.

Pickering 1585 1 papist. 1590 5 rectx. (Ric Dutton gent and wife) 1591-5 12. (Duttons) 1598-1600 10-1. (Duttons) 1604-6 11 rectx, 3-4 non-ctx. 1609 13 rectx. 1612 18. 1614 18, all at Goathland. 1616 Ric Stockton gent and wife. 1623 14. 1632-7 Elrington fam. 1641 same. 1663 5. 1706 9. (Goathland) 1743 5-6. (1 in Pickering) 1780 2 in Pickering, no Goathland return.

Seamer 1586 2 suspects. 1612-6 1 rect. 1625 1. 1630-41 3. 1663-90 1. 1706-33 nil. 1735 2 papists. 1743, 1767, 1780 nil.

Sinnington 1607 1 rect. 1611 Mrs Nendike, Mr Eden, 1 non-ct. 1615 Eden.

Thornton Dale 1580 Sir Rich Cholmley and family, Roger Cholmley and fam. rectx. 1586 Mrs Hunter rect. 1590-3 2 rectx, 5 non-ctx. (Mrs Hunter) 1596 3. 1600 Mrs Dutton rect, 4 non-ctx. (Rich Dutton gent, Mrs Hunter) 1606-7 4 rectx. (Duttons, Hunters, Thos Layton gent) 1622-4 Isabel wife of Ralph Salvin Esq and 3 others. rectx, 6 non-ctx. (Fras Boynton and fam.) 1635-41 3-4. (Hunters) 1676, 1706 nil. 1720s 1. 1735-67 nil. 1780 3.

Scalby 1598 1 rect. 1604 1 rect, 1 non-ct. 1607 6 rectx. 1612-9 2. 1663-5 8-13 papists at Harwood Dale. (Gideon Chapman gent) 1674 4. 1691 3. 1706 6. 1733 3. 1735 3 papists at Burneston. 1743-80 nil.

Wykeham 1582 Ric Harton gent and wife non-ctx. 1586 1-2. (Mrs Harton) 1615-22 Jas Harton rect. 1632 same. 1637 4 Hartons rectx. 1663-7 7 papists. (Mr Smith and fam., Jn Musgrave gent) 1674 9. (Musgrave, Nic Lacon gent) 1682-90 nil. 1706 nil. 1733 1. 1735 1. 1743 1. 1764-7 nil.

(5) ALLERTONSHIRE

Birkby 1569 rebels. 1575 3 non-ctx. (Tho Grimston gent and son) 1577 Grimston fam. rectx. 1580 Lanc. Conyers gent and fam. rectx. 1586 3. (Conyers) 1591-6 11, 2 non-ctx. 1600 21. (Conyers) 1604-7 14. (Conyers, Mrs Stockdale) 1611 24. 1614 36. (Conyers, Tho Lowick gent and fam., Frs Storey gent and fam., Jn Bussy gent and wife, Mrs Simpson) 1615-6. (same, Jn Gower gent) 1626 Ralph Rokeby Esq and fam. rectx. 1632-7 Kath Tunstall, Conyers. 1663-7 Margt Conyers. 1671-4 3. (same) 1682, 1706 1. 1716-34 Marm. Palmes Esq and fam. 1743 nil. 1764-80 ?.

Hutton Convers (often included under Birkby) 1616 Jane wife of Geo Mallory papist. 1629 3 rectx. 1630 2. (Conyers) 1674 2.

Kirkby Sigston 1569 rebels. 1582 1 rect. 1586 2. 1596 1. 1604 2 (Bests), 2 non-ctx, Mrs Metcalfe rect. 1627-32 Mrs Marwood rect; Anabaptists. 1690, 1706 nil. 1726-32 Tho Middleton Esq and fam. papists. 1743 nil. 1767-80 nil ?.

Leake 1569 12 rebels. (Anth Greene) 1582 Jn Bussy gent non-ct. 1584 Danby fam. 1586 4 rectx (Danbys), 3 non-ctx. 1590-3 Mrs Danby, Greenes. 1594-7 9-10. (Danby, Jn Parkinson MD) 1600 6. 1604-7 6 non-ctx. (Greene, Danby, Jackson) 1609-12 6. (Mrs Crosby, Ric Ascough gent) 1619-27 Bridget Grange vid, Ric Sample gent and fam.,

Eliz Cockerell vid. gen'. 1633 Geo Johnson gent and wife, Jacksons. 1637-41 38. 1663-7 40 papists. (Jackson, Danby, Metcalfe) 1674 50. 1690 49. (Greene, Danby, Jackson, Robt Yorke) 1706 77 papists. 1743 4 fams. (Mrs Eliz Middleton) 1767 78 papists. 1780 62.

Northallerton 1569 145 rebels. 1578-82 1 rect, 3-4 non-cts. 1590 Jn Sayer Esq rect, 1 non-ct. 1594-6 14. (Sayer, Mrs Agnes Westhorpe, Jane Tunstall) 1604 20. 1612 17. 1615-21 Jn Constable gent suspect rect, Wm Best gent and wife rectx. 1628-9 Mrs Mead, Mark Errington gent. 1636 Jn Errington and wife. 1641 39. (Sayer, Mich Metcalfe gent, Collingwoods, Fras Clough gent) 1663 14-20. (Metcalfe, Sadler) 1679 36. (Metcalfe) 1690 Worsall 29. 1706 25. 1743-5 26. 1764 6 fams. 1767 38. 1780 52 papists.

North Otterington 1569 Metcalfe rebels. 1582 1 rect. 1600-4 2-4 Metcalfes. 1612-6 same, Chris Herbert gent and wife. 1625 9. (Danby) 1635-7 12. (Metcalfe, Marwood, Martin Gatenby) 1663-74 Metc. fam. 1679-85 same. 1690 3. 1706 3. 1743 2. 1764 nil. 1780 1 papist day labourer.

Osmotherley 1569 11 rebels. 1575 1 rect, 1 non-ct. 1582 3. (Ric Sample) 1590 Bowes fam. 1595-6 Mrs Margt Gatenby, Jn Bowes gent. 1604 Mrs Gatenby. 1607 2. 1611-2 16-7. (Bowes, Mrs Crosby, Lowicks) 1614 wife of Edw Eyre. 1619-20 Crosbys. 1626 9. (Meynell, Crosby) 1629 Edw Meynell gent. 1637 6 papists. 1663-80 ?. 1690 8. 1706 9. 1743-5 c. 15-20. 1764 3 fams. 1767 25 papists. 1780 33.

West Rounton 1569 2 rebels. 1601 1 suspect. 1630-2 2 papists. 1637 1. 1706 nil. 1743-67 nil. 1780 5 papists.

Sessay 1569 rebels. 1595 Jn Greene poor gent rect. 1614-6 Cecilia Bainbrigg gen' vid. rect. 1623 2 non-cts. 1706 1 papist. 1733 1. 1735-64 nil. 1780 1 papist.

Sockburn (imperfect, because part in Durham) 1596-1604 1. 1604 6. (Conyers) 1611-2 8. (Stockdale, Mrs Killinghall) 1618 Mrs Ascough. 1628 17. (Hodgsons) 1630-41 8. (Hodgson gents) 1673-4 5. (Ascoughs, Killinghalls) 1679 Ascough fam. 1690 10. (same) 1716 2 fams. 1743-5 3 fams. 1764-80 no returns.

Thornton le Street 1569 15 rebels. (Tho Talbot, Anth Nesam gents) 1576 Jn Brackenbury gent and fam. rectx. 1580 Meynell fam. 1590 Meynells and Talbots. 1592-5 same and Brackenburys. 1596 14 rectx, 1 non-ct. 1600 same. (Mrs Scrope) 1604 6 rectx, 13 non-cts. 1607 14. (Meynell, Talbot, Scrope) 1611 21. 1615 27. 1619-23 45. (Meynell, Talbot, Brackenbury) 1625 Mrs Barber. 1636 Jane Gatenby vid. 1637 Rob

Thornton gent, Tho Nicholson gent, 58 popish rectx. 1641 64 papists. 1650 Mrs Saltmarsh. 1667 32 papists. (Meynell, Saltmarsh) 1671 56. (Meynell, Peter Middleton Esq) 1690 42. 1743 8 papist fams. 1767 35. 1780 15. (Thos Sampson gent and fam.)

(6) EAST LANGBAURGH

Acklam 1590 Mrs Strangeways rect, 2 suspects. 1592-1613 same. 1676 nil. 1735 Acklam and Middlesbrough 2 papists. 1743-64 nil. 1765-7 1. 1780 ?.

Appleton Wiske 1569 9 rebels. 1585 1 papist, 20 not to church. 1586 28 rectx. (Bowes) 1590 18. (Bowes) 1592-6 same. 1607 7 rectx (Bowes), 3 non-ctxs. 1604 10. 1611 19 rectx. (Bowes, Bests) 1612-3 20. 1622-4 32. (Bests, Bowes, Robt Rayner MD) 1632-7 c. 25. 1663-90 ?. 1715-33 1 family papists. 1735 5. 1743 2 fam. 1765 8 fams. 1760 17.

Great Ayton 1569 30 rebels. 1590 Chris Fulthorpe gent rect. 1592-3 3. (same) 1596-8 2. (Geo Stockdale gent) 1604 Merial Yoward vid, Mrs Edith Bulmer non-ctxs. 1607 2 rectx (Bulmer), 1 non-ctx. 1608-11 4-5. (Yoward) 1612-3 13 rectx. (same) 1614 11. (Mrs Yoward) 1619 5. 1623 7. (Bulmer) 1632 3. (Mrs Mgt Middleton) 1641 1. 1674 1. 1685 6 papists. 1690 1 fam. 1706 11. 1735 1. 1764 1 fam. 1780 9 papists.

Carlton 1597-1600 1 rect. 1625 2. 1690 2 papists. 1706 4. 1727 2. 1735 1. 1743 nil. 1764 2 Rom. Cath. fams. 1765 c. 8. 1780 22 papists.

Crathorne 1569 Peter and Geo Crathorne gents rebels. 1577 Fras Fulthorpe gent rect. 1592-3 Bridget Crathorne vid. 1594-5 3 rectx (same), 2 non-ctxs. 1596-1600 same. (Fulthorpes) 1604 16 rectx. (Crathornes, Fulthorpes) 1611 5 rectx, 1 non-ctx. 1615 5 rectx. 1623 8 rectx, 13 non-ctxs. 1629 21. (Crathornes, Nic Fox gent, Fras Moore gent, Hercules Fulthorpe) 1633 Hugh and Eliz Crosland. 1639 Reignold gent. 1641 25 rectx. 1663 33. (Crathorne, Anth Beckwith) 1667 46 papists. 1674 56. 1676 61. 1690 26. (Wm Burnett gent, Mr Nevill) 1706 66. 1736 20 fams. (63) 1743 c. 70 1764 26 fams. (out of 59) 1765 29 fams. 1767 94 papists. 1780 88.

Hilton 1588 Mr Cuth Meynell papist. 1596 Ann Bulmer. 1599 2. 1600 1-2 1604 3. 1607-9 3. 1611-6 6-9. 1619 5. (Mrs Middleton) 1620-4 5 rectx (Mrs M, Wm Gascoigne gent and wife, Ric Gascoigne, Wm Bowes gent, Robt Meynell gent), 12 non-ctxs. 1625 17 rectx. 1627 22. (Gascoignes, Middletons, Meynells) 1634-40 c. 20 (same) 1633 12 papists (Anth Dawson gent), 6 others (Middleton) 1667 33. 1674 30. (same, Mrs Edward Graham) 1682 23 (Middleton, Cath

Dawson) 1690 17. (Fred Thwing gent and wife) 1706 41. 1708 Fred Thwing. 1733 15. 1735 12. 1743 3 fams. 1764 5-6. 1765 5. 1780 4 papists.

Ingleby Arncliffe 1569 10 rebels. 1628-5 Mrs Pinckney. 1733 1. 1735 3. 1743 nil. 1764-7 nil. 1780 1 papist husbandman.

Ingleby Greenhow 1604 6 rectx. 1607 5. (Ascough) 1611-9 2-3. 1630-3 Mrs Ascough. 1635 2. (Barth Aislaby gent) 1636 4. (Ascoughs) 1676 1. 1706 5. 1733 10. 1735 6. 17-43 2 papist fams. 1767 some. 1780 1 family of 3 papists.

Kirk Leavington 1569 5 rebels. 1582 1 non-ct. 1590 2 rectx. 1595-6 3. 1600-2 2-3. 1604 22. 1605 32. (Jane Goldesbrough) 1621 Ambrose Pudsey gent and wife. 1623-6 same, Rich Norton gent. 1630-5 same, Simon Rymer gent. 1636 18. (Pudseys) 1641 27 (same, Ric Pearson gent) 1663 3. (Pudsey) 1667 9. (Place, Margt Anne vid) 1674 25. (Anne, Norton) 1685 Pudseys. 1690 13. (Norton) 1706 16. (Pudsey) 1733-5 2. 1745 5 fams. 1764 4 fams. 1765 19. 1767 5 (sic) 1780 6 papists.

Kildale 1569 5 rebels. 1595 Nic Cockerell. 1604 1. 1611 1. 1612-9 1 fam. 1674 1-3. 1682-5 same. 1690-1733 nil. 1737 2. 1743-5 1 fam. 1764-7 same. 1780 nil.

Kirkby in Cleveland 1569 28 rebels. 1570 1. 1607 1. 1612-3 1 rect, 1 non-ct. 1615 1 rect, 2 non-cts. 1623 1 non-ct. 1626 Ric Meynell gent. 1636-7 2. 1663 7. (Meynell) 1667 6 papists. 1676 16. 1680 4. 1690 5. 1706 2. 1733-5 nil. 1743 1. 1765 1. 1780 a woman and 4 children papists.

Marton 1569 21 rebels. 1595 1 non-ct. 1600 Mrs Wildon rect. 1596 1. 1605 8. (Wildons) 1612 same, Mrs Gower. 1623-5 2-4. 1625-7 2-3. 1637 Wm Metcalfe gent and wife. 1690 1. 1706, 1733 2 papists. 1735, 1767 nil. 1780 1.

Middlesbrough 1569 2 rebels. 1592-3 Mrs Strangways. 1615 1 non-ct. 1676 2. 1690 1 at Linthorpe. 1735 2. 1743 1. 1764 nil. 1767 some ? 1780 nil return.

Newton in Cleveland 1569 3 rebels. 1586 Jane Gascoigne rect. 1607 1. 1611 6. 1612-5 1. 1633-8 2-3. 1676-1733 nil. 1735-65 nil. 1767 2 papists. 1780 nil.

Ormesby 1569 26 rebels. (Asculph Cleasby gent) 1580 Asc. Cleasby. 1582 Ann Pennyman vid. rect. 1590 2. (Mrs Strangways) 1595-6 1 non-ct., 1 rect. 1615-21 2. (Mrs Addison) 1627 3. (Addisons)

1632-41 5. (same) 1676-1706 nil. 1733-5 7-8. 1743 1 fam. 1765 1 fam. 1780 12 papists.

Rudby in Cleveland 1569 7 rebels. 1585-6 2 papists long rectx, 3 others. 1593 4. (Jn Ingleby Esq) 1594-1600 same. 1605 7. 1609-11 8. (Inglebys) 1612 Jos Constable gent and fam. 1616 Mrs Mgt Middleton. 1625 7. (Ingleby, Fras and Jane Rokeby) 1632-41 c. 7-8. (Middletons, Inglebys, Jn Metcalfe gent and wife, Radcliffe gent) 1624-4 Mary Ward and companions. 1652 Jn Errington gent. 1663-7 18 papists. (Errington, Sayer) 1685 13. (Jas Sayer gent and wife) 1690 28. (Middleton, Sayer) 1706 44. (Middleton) 1733-5 32. 1743-5 c. 42. 1765 25. 1767 21. 1780 13 papists.

Seamer 1569 5 rebels. 1573 1 rect. 1600 1. 1604 3. 1605-7 5-6. 1611-6 2-6. 1616-41 2-3. 1664-7 3 papists. 1674-6 6. 1690 2. 1706 5. 1733 1. 1743-80 nil.

Stainton 1569 57 rebels. (Rich Gascoigne) 1575 1 rect. 1586 3. (Mrs Gower) 1590 7. (Anthony Wright gent and fam., Gascoignes) 1592-5 9. (Phillis Gower gen') 1600 6. (Gowers) 1604 7 rectx (Gowers, Mrs Lucas), 1 non-ct. 1607 8. 1611-4 14. (Gower, Ashleys) 1619 Mrs Conyers. 1623-5 15-6 rectx. (Gower, Tho Aislaby gent and wife, Robt Lascelles gent and wife) 1634-5 Aislabys, Ellen Rokeby vid. 1633 10. 1637-40 9. (Aislaby) 1663-7 9 papists. (Aislabys) 1676 17. 1685 Thos & Lawrence Meynell gents. 1690 14. 1706 12. 1733 7. 1735 4. 1743-5 1 fam. 1764 9. 1780 14 papists.

Stokesley 1569 30 rebels. (Rob Pennyman gent) 1582 10 non-ctxs. (Rob Yoward gent and wife) 1592-3 2 rectx. 1598-9 8 rectx. 1600 5 rectx, 4 non-ctxs. (Yoward) 1604 26 new rectx, 2 old, 1 non-ct. 1605-7 18. (Wm Marwood gent) 1611 16. (Sir Wm Eure and wife, Ralph Lambert gent) 1612-3 22. (same) 1614 29. 1619 17. 1623 Foster family. 1629 Mrs Metcalfe. 1641 46 papists. (Fosters, Metcalfe of Tanton, Wm Ward gent) 1663-7 64-9. (Fosters, Meynells, Bradley gent) 1674 89. (same) 1676 826 inhabitants—45 Prot. Diss. and 105 Papists. (Foster, Piersons) 1682-5 70. 1690 54. 1706 53. (Pierson) 1735 c. 20. 1743 c. 40 1764 4 fams. 1765 24. 1767 68 papists (sic) 1780 21.

Whorlton 1569 27 rebels. 1583 1 non-ct. 1586 3 rectx, 1 non-ct. 1590 2 rectx. 1592-3 9. 1594-5 8. 1600 7. (Waterton) 1604 8 rectx, 2 non-ctxs. 1613 9. (Jos Constable gent and wife) 1614-20 6-7. 1627 Mrs Bate. 1628 Tho Smeaton gent. 1637 Rob Askew gent and wife papists. 1641 2. 1667 4. (Anth Greene gent and wife), 8 non-ctxs.

1676 7 papists. 1690-1706 nil ?. 1733 1. 1735 8. (Tho Middleton)
1743 7. 1764 3. 1765 4 fams. and a lodger. 1767 16 papists. 1780 4.

Yarm 1569 50 rebels. 1572-5 1 non-ct. 1582 same. 1586 3 non-cts.
(Fras Sayer gent and wife) 1592-3 1 rect. 1594-5 4 (Sayers), 2 non-cts.
1600 4-5. 1604 1 non-ct, 5 rectx. 1607 9 rectx. 1612-5 5-7. (Sayer)
1618 Mrs Gower. 1621 Robt Renold MD and wife. 1631-2 4. (Geo
Conyers gent and wife, Wm Metcalfe gent, Jn Errington gent) 1641 13.
1663-7 c. 15. (Sayer, Metcalfe, Lady Read) 1674-6 15. (Mrs Grundy)
1690 38 (Collingwoods, Busbys), Worsall 29. 1706 Yarm 45. 1708 Jn
Mayes Esq 1733 25. (Jn Foster gent) 1735 60. (Mayes, Douglas) 1743
12 fams. 1764 20 (sic) 1765 92 papists. 1767 108. 1780 120.

(7) WEST LANGBAURGH

Brotton 1582 3 (Mrs Loggan), 2 non-cts. 1585 11. 1586 19. (Loggan)
1590-6 7-8. 1604 29. 1607 25. 1611 70. 1614 44. 1638 Tho Metham
gent. 1639 Metham fam. 1641 44. (Methams) 1652 Ferd Thweng gent,
Geo Thweng and wife. 1667 25. (Thweng) 1674 26. (same) 1676 31
papists. 1685 13. 1690 11. 1706 nil. 1733 4. 1743 nil. 1764 2 fams.
1765 4. 1780 11.

Danby 1585-7 4. (Mgt Salvin vid) 1586 5 (Geo Tempest), 3 non-cts.
1590-6 10-2. (Fras Constable, Mrs Hargill) 1600 3. 1607 10. (Hargill)
1609-19 c. 12-5. (same) 1629 Robt Rainer MD. 1632-41 c. 8-9.
1663-7 ?. 1674-6 8 papists. 1690 15. 1706 7. 1708 Jn Ward senior.
1733 1. 1735 nil. 1743 1. 1764 1 fam. 1765 1. 1767 some. 1780 ?.

Easington 1572-4 Nic Banester gent rect. 1595 2. 1596 2 non-cts.
1604 1 rect. 1614-5 3 rectx, 1 non-ct. 1632 1 non-ct. 1641 Sir Robt
Conyers and wife not to church. 1676 3 papists. 1690 2. 1706 1. 1733 7.
1735 8. 1743 3. 1764 2 fams. 1765 2. 1767 some.

Egton 1572 Jane Salvin ?. 1580 c. 20. (Salvins, Smiths) 1582 9.
1585 'many'. 1586 12. 1590 28 (Salvin, Smith), Lealholm 4. 1592-3
28. 1596 Mrs Salvin. 1600 57. (Ric Fairfax gent and wife, Smith,
Salvin) 1604 55. 1607 62. 1611 Egton 33, Bridge 11, Grosmont 24,
E. Banks 10, Mircoside 46 (Ursula Cholmley vid), Shorthwaite 13,
Limber Hill 2. (139) 1614 175 rectx. (Salvin, Smith, Wm Coursey
gent) 1615 96 adults. 1616 81 adults. (Tho Lowick gent and wife)
1620 83. 1627 126 (Salvin, Smith) 1633 166. 1634-7 154. 1641 138.
1663 170 papists. (Salvin, Smith) 1674 209 not to church. 1676 610
inhabitants, of whom 217 papists. 1690 174 adults. (Salvin, Smith,
Fras Thorpe gent) 1706 256. 1735 135 presented. (Mr Jas Crathorne)

1743 28 fams. About 60 papists (sic). 1753 177 papists. 1764 37 fams. 1767 213. 1780 74 fams., 260. 1809 70 fams.

Glaisdale (often included under Egton) 1599 1 rect. 1706 nil return. 1708 Henry Harrison and fam. 1733 4. (Harrisons) 1735 12. (same) 1743 fams. 1765 same. 1780 34 papists. (Jos Harrison and family)

Guisborough 1569 28 rebels. (Thos Gower gent) 1570 suspects. 1571-8 3-4 rectx. (Tocketts) 1580 Roger Tocketts Esq. 1582 3 rectx (Gowers), 2 non-ctxs. 1585 4 rectx, 1 non-ctx. 1590 15 rectx. 1594-6 8 (Tocketts), 2 others in Yk Castle 1596-1600 12. 1604 39. (Tocketts, Jn Sym gent and wife) 1611 17. (Merial wife of Marm Bowes gent, Jn Fulthorpe gent) 1615 21. 1623 15 rectx (Robt Lascelles gent and wife, Tocketts), 2-3 non-ctxs. 1637 14. 1641 18. (Tocketts) 1663 25 papists. 1676 6. 1685 Gilbert Metcalfe gent and wife. 1690 5. (Metcalfes) 1706 22. 1733 5. (Metcalfes) 1735 10. 1743 6 fams. 1765 5 papists. 1767 9. 1780 6.

Hinderwell 1585 5 rectx. 1586 10. (Jn Fulthorpe) 1590 12. 1592-3 10. 1594-6 11 rectx, 1 non-ctx. 1600 2. 1604 5-6. 1607 7. 1615 6. 1632-41 Ann wife of Wm Douglas. 1663 7. 1674-6 5-6 papists. 1682 6. 1685 11. 1690 3. 1708 22 papists. 1733 2. 1735 8. 1743 3 fams. 1764 5 fams. 1780 16 papists.

Kirkleatham 1569 rebels. 1571 2 rectx. 1575 1 non-ctx. 1596 2 non-ctxs. (Fras Bulmer gent) 1607 4 rectx. (Ralph Rokeby gent and wife, Bulmers) 1611-2 Yearby—Geo Jackson gent and family. 1624 3 rectx (Bulmers), Sir Bertram Bulmer non-ctx. 1632-40 2-3 rectx. (Bulmers 1663-74 ?). 1676 1 papist. 1690 nil. 1706 1. 1733-5 nil. 1767 some. 1780 nil, though Mr Turner has 3 foreign servants going to church.

Liverton 1595 1 rect. 1607-15 Janet Tirwhitt. 1632 1 non-ctx. 1682-5 '2 being papists nominally.' 1690, 1706 nil. 1733 1 papist. 1743 1. 1743, 1764 nil. 1765 1. 1767 and 1780 1 papist.

Loftus 1580 1 rect. 1582 1 non-ctx. 1585 same. 1590 8 rectx. 1592-6 5-8. 1600 2 rectx, 1 non-ctx. 1604 16 rectx, 4 non-ctxs. 1607 16 rectx, 1 non-ctx. 1612-3 21. 1615-6 17-8. 1727 10. 1637 11 popish rectx. 1641 19. 1667 10 papists. (wife of Leonard Beckwith gent) 1674 5. (Mrs Beckwith) 1676 6. 1680 9. (Thos Moore gent and wife, son Thos) 1682 same. 1685 5. 1690 5 (Moore) 1706 3. 1716 Zachary Moore Esq papist. 1719-22 same and wife. 1733 9. 1735 15. 1743 3 fams. 1764 same. 1780 20 and a reputed popish school.

Lythe 1577 Robt Morton gent rect, Roger Radcliffe Esq suspect. 1582 3 non-ctxs. (Loggan) 1586 4 rectx. 1590 38 rectx (Westrop Read-

man gent and wife, Radcliffes, Peter Wilberforce, Jn Trollop, Lady Ann Neville dau. to Earl of Westmorland, Jn Fulthorpe), 8 non-cts. (Fras Fulthorpe) 1591-3 22. (same, Robt Harding gent and fam., Henry Thorney gent, Fras Aislaby and wife, Dorothy Tindall) 1594-6 17. 1600 32. (Radcliffe, Readman, Harding, Thorn) 1604 30. (Fras Salvin) 1607 40. 1613 42. 1616 55. (same gentry, Ann Lady Ingleby, Jn Fulthorpe) 1621 30. (Hy Ridley gent, Simon Ridley gent, Harding, Radcliffe, Readman) 1625 45. 1627 40. 1633-7 c. 35. 1641 same. 1663 12 popish rectx. 1667 89 popish rectx. (sic) (Radcliffes) 1674 Mickleby 8, Newton Mulgrave 3, Newby 6, Ellerby 3, Hutton Mulgrave 2, Lythe 114. (Radcliffes Mrs Belwood) 1676 Of 291 inhabitants, 15 separatists and 20 papists. (sic) 1674-82 Ann and Ellen Lascelles. 1690 98. 1706 135 papists. (Radcliffe) 1733 95. 1735 53 (Rich Smith gent and fam.) 1741 Jn Batty Esq papist. 1743 31 papist fams. 1764 423 fams, 895 Anglican communicants, about 20 fams. of papists of 57 persons. 1765 Of 439 fams. 19 of papists, 63 persons. 1767 86. 1780 97. (Mr Wm Gage als. Wm Gage Oliveres) 1781 119 Easter duties. 1788 112. 1795 118.

Marske 1569 rebels. 1571 2-3 rectx. 1582 1 non-ct. 1608 Ralph Rokeby Esq and wife rectx. 1609 same. 1611 8 rectx. (Rokebys) 1612 same with Robt Conyers gent of Hutton. 1614-6 Rokebys. 1619 6. (Geo Jackson gent and fam.) 1623 4. 1663 3 papists. 1667 2. 1676 7. 1690 nil. 1701 3. 1706 1. 1733 1. 1735 1. 1743-80 nil returns.

Skelton 1580 Cath Conyers, dau. of late Ld Conyers, Ralph Gower Esq rectx. 1583 3 rectx. 1585 13 obstinate rectx. (Ellerbys) 1586 8. (same) 1590 9. (same) 1592-5 15. (same), Mrs Thorpe vid. 1600 7. 1604 15, Robert Trotter Esq and wife non-cts. 1607 13. 1611 18. 1614 Geo Jackson gent and wife. 1619 9. 1627 7 rectx, 2 non-cts. 1634 9 rectx. 1637 (with Brotton) 56. 1663-7 ?. 1676 9 papists. 1690 6. 1706 16 papists. 1733 variously 15 or 23. (Jn Sayer gent and wife) 1735 22. (Sayer, farmer) 1743 (with Brotton) 7 fams. 1765 6 persons. 1767 19 papists. 1780 13 papists. (Harrisons).

Upleatham 1569 rebels. 1604 Tho Tocketts gent vagrant rect. 1615-9 odd non-cts. 1623 1 rect. 1676 with Guisborough. 1690-1780 nil or no separate returns.

Westerdale 1569 rebels. 1595-6 Merial wife of Rob Yoward gent non-ct., 1 rect. 1604-7 1 rect. 1618-25 3-4 rectx. 1655 Mr Cholmley (of Brandsby) rect here. 1676 4 papists. 1690 6. 1705 2 heads of fams. 1706-7 5. 1715-20 2-3. 1733-43 with Stokesley. 1780 2 papists.

(8) WHITBY STRAND LIBERTY

Whitby 1572 Sir Richd Cholmley accted Cath. 1580 Henry Fairfax gent and wife rectx. 1590 Whitby 10 rectx (Lady Kath Scrope, Mgt Cholmley, Fairfaxes), Eskdaleside 12, Aislaby 1. 1591-3 Whitby 23, Esk 7, Ais. 1, Ugglebarnby 3, Staithes 1. (35) 1595 Whitby 38 (same with Ambrose Pudsey gent, Mr Ric Dutton and wife), Esk. 8, Ais. 1, Ugg. 4, Dean Hall 6, non-cts 10 (Hy Cholmley Esq and wife). 1596 same with Mrs Readman, Mrs Hunter, Mrs Strangways, Jas Hebburn gent and wife, Mr Saltmarsh, Prudence Hunter. 1600 Whitby c. 15 (Fairfaxes), Esk. 18 (Mrs Hunter), Ugg. 11 (Marg. Conyers). 1604 Whitby 25 (Fairfax, Mrs Eliz Cockerell), Esk. 30 (Jas Hebburn), Ugg. 13 (68). 1605 Sleights 11. 1607 Esk. Ursula Cholmley rect. 1611 Esk. 28 rectx (Tho Metham gent and fam., Rich Stockdale gent and fam.), Stansacre 3, Ruswarp 3, Dunsley 22 (Fairfaxes), Ais. 8 (64) 1613 Margt Conyers vid. 1613 62. (same, Robt Thwing gent and wife, Robt Trotter) 1616 Eliz wife of Geo Cockerell gent. (Stakesby) 1627 Ais. 6; Esk. 17 (Thwings); Ugg. 1 non-ct; Whitby 24. (Fairfax, Cockerell) 1637-41 59 popish rectx. (Jn. Rawse gent, Rebecca Salvin vid, Wm and Geo Salvin, Hy Cockerell gent) 1667 Esk. 15 (Edmund Crathorne and wife); Ugg. 2; Whitby 20. (Hy Cockerell) 1676 population 1640, Prot. dissenters 97, papists 24. 1690 Whitby 6; Ruswarp 5; Dunsley 15; Esk. 15; Ugg. 1; Ais. 5. (47) 1706 Whitby 51; Esk. 10; Ugg. nil. (61) 1733 40 papists. 1735 46. 1737 40 adults, apart from children. 1743 1325 families Anglican, 132 fams. Prot Dissenters, 25 fams. of papists—'all pretty numerous ones.' 1764 Of 1699 families in all, 134 are Prot. Dissenting fams., 10 papist fams. 1765 papists reported 'slowly decreasing'. 1767 68 papists. 1780 Whitby 87, Esk. 3, Ugg. 2, Ais. 1 (93).

Hackness 1582 1 suspect rect. 1586 4 rectx. 1590 3 and also Wm Lacy gent. 1600 1 rect, 5 non-cts. 1659 Tho Moore gent suspect. 1663 3 papists. (Mrs Moore) 1665 4. (Thos Moore gent) 1666 same. 1672 3. (Moore) 1674 4. (Moore) 1676 16. 1679 5. 1690-1 2. 1706 3. 1709 2-3. 1733-80 nil or no returns.

Sneaton 1582-6 Margt wife of Jas Strangways gent rect. 1590 4. (same, Thos Strangways gent, Jane Conyers, Agnes wife of Tho Williamson) 1592-5 2. (Strangways) 1600 4. (Strangways) 1607 1. 1611 2. 1624-7 1 rect, 1 non-ct. 1632-7 2-4 rectx. 1665-74 2-3. 1676 2 papists. 1682-5 4. 1690-1764 nil. 1765 1 papist. 1767 nil. 1780 3 papists.

Fylingdales 1586 3 rectx. 1590 3 rectx 'many years.' 1595 15. (Mr

Fras Aislaby of Fyling Hall and fam., Marg Conyers vid) 1596 21. (same) 1600 35 obstinate rectx. (Aislabys) 1604 24 (same), 2 Aislaby non-ctx. 1607 24 rectx, 1 non-ctx. 1611 34 rectx. (Aislabys, Rob Thwing gent and wife) 1612 32. 1619 18, 4 more relapsed rectx. (Aislaby) 1632-7 8-10. 1641 7. 1663-7 4-5 papists. 1676 7. 1685 5. 1690 5. 1706-33 nil. 1735 4. 1743 2. 1764 1 papist fam. 1765 5 persons. 1780 3 papists.

(9) SCARBOROUGH

1565 Sir Ric Cholmley and son papists. 1580 1 rect ?. 1582 5 non-ctx. 1583 Thos Williamson gent and wife papists. 1586 Jn Aislaby suspect, 2 others rectx ? 1589 Rob Dalby and Edmund Burden, priests, landed here. 1596 3 non-ctx. 1606 1 suspect. 1620-5 7 rectx (Mrs Susanna Allen, Rich Conyers, Wm Lawson, Tho Burton), 8-10 intermittent. 1625-30 Jn Wolfe rect, 4-6 occasional. (Conyers) 1630-42 Jn Wolfe popish rect; 12 doubtful. (Mrs Allen, Mrs Conyers) 1644 Lord Dunbar, his 2 sons, Michael Wharton Esq papists. 1661-6 Sir Jordan Crosland and wife papists. 1678-9 Jonathan Moone gent and 3 others papists, 1 reputed papist. 1681-3 7-8 papists. (Napper gent, Moone) 1685-6 same. 1691 nil return. 1695-8, in season, Sir Philip Constable papist. 1706, 1733 nil returns. (but Cath. gentry at Spa) 1735 10 papists. 1740-1 9 converts. 1743 3 fams. 1764 vague return. 1767 no return. 1780 24 papists (Langdales, Crathornes).

(10) RICHMOND

1562 Wm Pepper gent rect ? 1569 c. 60 rebels (Jn Gower, Robt Heighington, Marm Clarkson gents), 4 rectx. (Tho Wray gent and wife, Ann Gower vid) 1571-2 3 papists. (Wray, Gower) 1575-7 1 rect. 1578 3 non-ctx. (Dame Alice Sedgwick) 1580 2 rectx. (Lucy Sedgwick) 1587 13 rectx. (Gower-?Wray) 1592-3 18 rectx. (of whom 6 Cath) 1594-7 6-7 papists. (Atkinson) 1604 7 papists. (Lady Gascoigne, Mrs Beckwith) 1616 wife of Fras Wycliffe rect. 1626-8 12 papists. (Mrs Hutchinson) 1629 Jane Wyvill vid. 1630 14. (Wyvill, Mrs Wildon) 1633 12. (Mrs Molineux) 1669 22 papists. (Jn Metcalfe gent and wife, Chris Smithson gent and wife, Mary Binks vid, Ann Sedgwick) 1671 21. 1673 14 papists (same, Thos Thweng gent), 11 Quakers, 7 sectaries, 80-90 non-ctx. 1675 36 popish rectx. (Tho Thweng, Eliz Appleby, Edw Raine gent, Smithsons, Aiskews, Metcalfes, Binks) 1679 15. (Lady Beckwith) 1681 14. (Beckwith) 1705 Anth Frankland gent. 1717 same, Geo Anderson gent and fam., Jn Nendyke gent, Binks. 1724 47 papists.

1726-32 Roger Strickland Esq and fam., Humph Sainthill gent. 1748-54 15 fams. (Nendyke, Mr Robt Johnson, Dr Pringle) 1760 Stricklands, Nendykes. 1789 90 papists. 1811 120.

(11) HANG WEST WAPENTAKE

Aysgarth 1566-8 9 men gaoled for keeping Cath. objects. 1569 78 rebels, 4 executed, 125 fined. (Leonard and Wm Metcalfe gents) 1571-4 5 papists. (Metcalfes of Bear Park) 1578-9 7 rectx. (Metcalfes of BP, Roger Metcalfe gent of Aysgarth) 1580 2. 1587 16 rectx. (Ralph Montforth gent, Metcalfes) 1588-90 10 rectx, 2 non-ctxs. 1595-6 12 rectx. (Metcalfes of BP, Mrs Middleton of Hardraw) 1601-3 2. (Metcalfes) 1694 4 rectx (Metcalfes, Mrs Spence), 4 non-ctxs. (Roger Metcalfe gent) 1611-4 8. 1616-9 8. (Metcalfes) 1624 16 rectx. (Mrs Edith Robinson, Wm Fauconbridge gent of Nappa) 1627 10. 1628 Eliz Nelson gen'. 1630-2 10. (Metcalfes, Robinson) 1633 10. 1635 Geo Scarr gent. 1637 Tho Horsley gent, Jn Sothaby gent and wife. 1641 19. (Sothaby, Scarr) 1664-6 Aysgarth 15-20 papists, Askrigg 6-8 papishes (Lamberts) 1673-5 12. 1679 Aysgarth 22 papists, Askrigg 9. 1690 19. (Leo Dryer gent) 1716 Mrs Margt Walker, Geo Reynaldson gent and fam. 1743-5 6. (Mr Fras Wilson surgeon, Mrs Barbara Smith) 1766 Aysgarth 1 family. (Shaws) 1789 no return. 1811 nil.

Coverham 1569 67 rebels, 5 executed (Ric & Oswald Topham), 56 fined. 1573 Edw Topham gent non-ctx. 1604 5 non-ctxs. (Tophams, Anth Bainbrigg) 1605 Cecilia Bainbrigg vid. 1611-2 same. 1614-6 3 rectx. 1624-6 9 rectx. (Bainbrigg, Topham, Edw and Geo Bowes gents, Mrs Eliz Croft) 1630-3 9. (same) 1641 10 rectx. (Croft, Topham) 1665 c. 35-40 papists. (Topham) 1676 6 papists. (Croft, Bradrigg) 1679 4. 1690-1743 ?. 1744-5 3 families. 1789 2 papists. 1811 2.

Downholme 1562 Fras Lascelles gent suspect. 1569 11 rebels, 42 fined. 1590-1 5 non-ctxs. 1592 Thos Lascelles gent and wife non-ctxs. 1595 2 rectx, 1 non-ctx. 1602 2 rectx. 1604 2 rectx, 3 non-ctxs. (Mrs Ann Scrope) 1612 5 rectx. (Mrs Scrope vid) 1614-6 4. (Kath wife of Tho Conyers Esq) 1618 4. (Tho Conyers Esq and wife) 1619 3. (Conyers) 1622-6 2. 1634-5 2. 1636 Anthony Frankland Esq and servant rectx. 1638-41 5. (Franklands) 1669 8 papists. (Frankland) 1670 10. (same) 1673-81 7. (same) 1690 10. (same) 1716 3. 1766 5 papists. 1789 3 papist families.

Fingall 1569 8 rebels (Marm Wyvill gent), 1 executed, 45 fined. 1571 Chris Wyvill Esq rect. 1572-5 Wyvills. 1590 2 non-ctxs. 1593

1 non-ct. 1611-4 2 (Wyvill). 1621 9 rectx. (Lady Wyvill) 1623 13. (Lady Gascoigne, Wyvills, Eliz Rokeby) 1628 Mrs Middleton of Akebar. 1630 16 rectx. (Gascoigne, Wyvill, Middleton) 1633 17. (same) 1635 7. (Jn Waterton gent) 1641 6. 1664-5 14 popish rectx. (Jn Petch gent) 1666 26. 1667 15 (sic). 1671 7 papists. 1679-81 10. 1690 18. (Chris Scrope gent) 1724 5. 1745 3 families. 1766 3 papists. 1789 4.

Grinton 1569 2 rebels, 9 fined. 1584 some papists. 1587 2 non-cts. 1590 36 rectx, 5 non-cts. (Geo Lascelles gent, Ric Thirkeld) 1594-5 29. 1602 Solomon Swale gent and wife, Roger Gower gent and wife of Reeth rectx. 1604 38 rectx (Swales, Mrs Gower), 23 non-cts. Muker 7 rectx. 1611 Grinton 9 (Swales), Healaugh Mrs Gower, Whiteside 1, Gunnerside 20, Muker 2, Setron 1. (34) 1614-6 30. (Swale, Mrs Eliz Molineux) 1623 Thos Molineux Esq and wife rectx. 1641 23. (Swale) 1665 Mich Pudsey gent and wife. 1666 28 popish rectx. 1671 Muker 12 papists. 1690 Grinton 10, Muker 6, Reeth 20. (36) 1708-9 5 families. 1724 33 papists. 1766 Wintering Garth 10, Gunnerside 13, Ivelet 19. (42) 1790 Ivelet 3 fams. 1789 no return. 1811 Muker 2 fams.

Hauxwell 1569 19 rebels, 2 executed, 13 fined. 1579 Fras Spence gent, Mrs Burgh rectx, Wm Thoresby of Barden gent and wife, Fras Burgh of Garriston gent non-cts. 1578 Thoresbys, Burghs non-cts. 1590 Mrs Thoresby rect. 1595-6 Thoresbys. 1611-4 Mrs Spence rect. 1616 3 rectx. (Spence, Frances Cholmley) 1617 Ric Cholmley Esq and dau. rectx. 1619-21 Mgt Spence, Bridget Constable. 1632-9 1-2. (Mrs Spence) 1641 19 rectx. (Mrs Jane Bulmer, Alice Conyers) 1664-71 nil. 1679 Spences. (?) 1690 nil. 1703 1 papist. 1724 2. 1745 1 fam. 1789 ?.

Middleham 1569 39 rebels, 2 executed, 29 fined. 1600 1 rect. (?) 1604 1 non-ct. 1607-12 1 rect. 1614 5. 1616 4. 1620 1. 1622-9 2-4. (Mrs Lindley) 1635 8. (Lindley, Spence) 1637-9 2-3. 1641 9. (Spence) 1673-4 c. 10 papists. 1690 11. 1706 8. 1724 1. 1743-5 4 fams. (Topham) 1759-68 Tophams, Ingrams, Hornbys, Horners. 1770-78 Topham, Hill, Sturdy, Hixon, Jefferson. 1789 no return.

Spennithorne 1569 4 rebels, 3 fined. 1587 Mrs Scrope non-ct. 1590-5 Mrs Dorothy Scrope rect. 1599 Mrs Hyndmers rect. 1602 1. 1604 3. (Mrs Ashe) 1607 Mrs Eshe (sic) 1611-9 6-10. (Scropes, Eshes) 1620-9 same, Ann Pullein. 1633 Sir Fras Metcalfe rect. 1636 9. (Scropes) 1664-5 15 papists. 1669 19. 1679 14. 1690 11. 1708 5 fams. 1724 16. 1745 4 fams. 1766 Harmby 4 papists. 1789 3.

Thornton Steward 1169 1 rebel executed. 1571 Hy Scrope Esq non-ct.

1582 Hy Scrope, Mrs Hyndmers papists. 1587 Scropes non-cts. 1590 6 refts (Scrope), 2 non-cts. 1592-3 4-5. (Scropes) 1597 7. 1597-1602 2-3. 1604 8 refts, 1 non-ct. 1607-16 5-6. (Scropes) 1623-4 8-9. 1625 Mrs Dorothy Conyers. 1630 17 refts. (Conyers) 1641 15. (same) 1669 24 papists. (Scrope, Jas Thornton gent) 1673-5 same, Mich Errington, Simon Topham. 1679 26. 1690 24. (Scrope, Errington, Allen) 1708 8 fams. 1724 25 papists. 1743-4 Scropes, Allens. 1766 22. (Scrope, Mich Errington) 1789 25.

Wensley 1568-9 Mary of Scots and her suite. 1592-3 Ann Waite vid of Leyburn. 1595-1603 4 refts. (Waite) 1604 9 refts, 5 non-cts. 1611-2 Leyburn 12 (Waite), Wensley 6. 1618 22. (Waite) 1628 Mrs Frankland, Mrs Atkinson. 1630 23. 1641 35. (Waite, Atkinson, Bainbrigg gents) 1665 39 papists. 1669 27 refts. (Waite). 1673 30 papists. 1675 16 (Waite), 7 more at Ridmer and Bolton. 1690 Wensley 10, Leyburn 22 (Waite, Allen), Ridmer 1. 1724 16. 1713 40 papists. 1743-4 Wm Allen gent, Fras Thornbrough Esq, Tho Errington papists. 1766 Wensley 60-70 papists, Leyburn 36. (Thornbrough, Allen) 1789 80 papists. 1791 7 families. (Wm Allen gent)

East Witton 1569 29 rebels, 14 fined. 1595 1 rect. 1599 1. 1604 6 non-cts. (Ascoughs) 1611-9 4-6 refts. 1623-4 11. (Mrs Fras Ascough) 1631 17. (Jn Covell gent and fam.) 1641 11. (Tho Horner gent) 1664-5 11 papists. (Jn Covell) 1666 18. 1673 16. (Jn Covell) 1679-81 same. 1707-8 9 papists. 1716 10 fams. 1724 40 papists. 1766 15. (Mrs Errington, Frances Ascough) 1789 2 papists.

West Witton 1569 12 rebels, 2 executed, 19 fined. 1624 2 refts. 1664 3 papists. 1665 4. 1671 4. (Wm Wise gent) 1673 2. 1675 2. 1679-81 nil. 1685 1. 1716-24 1-2. 1745 2. 1766 5 papists. 1789 3 families. 1811 16 papists.

(12) HANG EAST WAPENTAKE

Bedale 1569 c. 100 rebels, 6 executed, 120 fined. 1587 6 refts. 1595 5. (Mrs Gower and dau.) 1599 2. 1600-1 1. 1604 4 refts, 4 non-cts. 1611 8. 1612-6 5-7 refts. (Mary wife of Geo Metcalfe gent of Firby) 1618 Mrs Hargrave. 1619 3. (same) 1624 5 refts (Metcalfe), 5 non-cts. 1628-9 12 refts. (Metcalfe) 1633 20. (same) 1641 19. 1664 Mrs Scrope. 1669 20 papists. (Metcalfes, Fras Binks gent and wife) 1675 30. (same) 1679 29. (Jas Thornton gent, Binks) 1690 Aiskew 11, Bedale 16. (Thornton) 1723 Lady Stapleton and family. 1766 Aiskew 31 papists, Bedale 34 (Mr Tho Heddon), Burrill 1, Crakehalls 5, Lang-

thorne 8. (81 and 1 other suspected) 1772 Bedale 28, Aiskew 26 (Mrs Strickland and fam.), Crakehall 1, Langthorne 1, Burrill 1. (57) 1789 40. 1811 12.

Catterick 1569 51 rebels, 1 executed, 29 fined. 1575-7 3 refts. 1580 c. 15 refts. (Lawsons, Clebornes, Calverts) 1590 8. (Mrs Lawson, Mrs Cleborne, Mrs Scrope) 1593-5 4. (Lawson) 1596-1600 7. (Lawson, Marm Conyers) 1604 Mrs Clavert non-ct. 1611-6 8. (Lady Lawson, Rich Cholmley Esq and wife) 1622 Mgt Layton gen' of Scorton. 1625-6 15. (Lawson, Mrs Wandesford, Mrs Frankland, Mrs Beckwith, Cholmleys) 1630 25. 1633 Leonard Calvert gent and wife refts. 1641 11. (Cholmleys) 1665 20 papists. 1669 34. (Lawson, Tho Bainbridge gent and wife) 1675 c. 50 papists. (Sir Jn Lawson and fam., Sir Stafford Braithwaite and fam.) 1681 c. 30. (Geo Iles, Ann Saville) 1685 Calvert Smithson gent. 1690 29. (Lawson, Ralph Croft gent) 1711 Hipswell 4. (Geo Collingwood gent) 1719 Roger Strickland gent and fam. 1724 57 papists. 1766 108. (Lawson) 1789 c. 80.

Hornby 1569 5 men fined for helping the rising. 1580 Thos Darcy Esq, wife, fam. and 3 servants refts. 1582 Oswald Metcalfe gent rect. 1590 8 non-cts. (Darcy, Conyers, Tankard) 1592-3 Mrs Darcy, Mrs Conyers refts. 1594-5 1 rect, 2 non-cts. (Tho Darcy Esq) 1604 11 refts (Tho Darcy Esq, wife, Jn Girlington gent and wife), 6 non-cts. (Robt Meynell, Ann Babthorpe) 1606 Eliz Darcy vid rect. 1611-2 Mrs Covell, Lady Gascoigne refts, Lord Darcy suspect. 1613 Mary wife of Roger Gower gent rect. 1616-7 same, 2 servants, Mrs Pudsey. 1624 Mrs Covell. 1629 Eliz Pudsey vid. 1641 2. 1664-5 1 papist. 1667-70 2. 1671 3. 1724 1. 1743-4 1 or more. 1766ff. ?.

Kirkby Fletham 1569 9 rebels, 2 executed, 24 fined. (Hy Wycliffe gent) 1587 3 refts. 1590 wife of Tho Metham gent and another refts. 1592-5 1. 1597 2. 1601-4 1. 1630-33 1. 1664-70 nil. 1674-85 ?. 1726 1 papist.

Masham 1569 14 rebels, 37 fined. 1571 1 rect, 3 suspects. 1572 Sir Tho Danby non-ct. 1577 3-4 refts, 1 non-ct, 1 suspect. 1580 3 refts. 1586 2. 1591-3 7. (Danbys) 1595-9 37 refts. (Danby, Ann Wray vid, Mary Bulmer, Ann Gower gen') 1604 40 (Danby, Norton), 33 non-cts (Lady Wyvell, Mrs Wyvell, Jn and Robt Dodsworth gents, Jn Normavell gent, Robt Norton gent, Hy Chaytor, Robt Wyvell), also 12 new refts, 4 new non-cts. (93) 1611 Lady Yorke. 1618 45. (Danby, Norton, Wyvell) 1623 108 popish refts. (same, Malham, Talbot) 1626 Tho Salpwick gent, Jas Waite gent. 1630 37. 1635 Jn Wharton gent, Kath

wife of Mr Wharton. 1641 60. 1663 35 papists. 1664-6 38. 1690 31. 1708 4 fams. 1724 6. 1743 1 papists. 1766 2 papists in the whole parish. 1772 6 in Fearby.

Patrick Brompton 1569 30 rebels, 31 fined. 1578 Wm Wyvell gent and wife non-cts, Agnes Layton rect. 1579 Mrs Wyvell rect. 1580 1 rect. 1587 10. 1595 1. 1613 1. 1614 Mrs Covell of Arrathorne non-ct. 1616 2 rectx. 1619 Mrs Croft of Hunton rect. 1619-25 Ann Wild vid, wife of Jn Wild gent of Hunton and 2 others rectx. 1626 Jane Wyvell vid rect. 1629 Theodosia Towneley vid and 3 others. 1630-7 7. (Towneleys, Wilds) 1634-7 Jane Covell. 1641. 1641 4. (Wild, Covell) 1650 Mrs Wild. 1665-9 24 papists. (Wild) 1675-9 12-4. (Jn Fenwick gent and dau.) 1681 9. 1690 13. (Fenwick) 1724 4. 1766 1. 1789 ?.

Scruton 1569 24 rebels, 1 executed, 46 fined. 1586 Eliz and Cath Danby papists. 1587 6 suspects. (Cuth Strangways, Eliz Danby gen', Isabel Danby, Jn Danby gent and wife) 1590 3 non-cts, 2 suspects. 1611-3 1. 1632-3 1. 1663 nil. 1669 1 non-ct. 1670 5 rectx. 1673 same. 1690 nil. 1708 1 papist. 1724 nil. 1766 2. 1789 ?.

Thornton Watlass 1569 8 rebels, 1 ? executed, 20 fined. 1579 1 rect. 1592-5 1 rect, 1 non-ct. 1610 2 rectx. 1608-14 Bernard Williamson goldsmith rect. 1618 Isabel Williamson vid. 1624-33 Watlass: 3-4 rectx (Williamsons) Clifton 1-2. 1664-9 Watlass: Ann Williamson, Clifton 2, Thirn 1. 1673-5 5 papists. (Williamsons) 1690 Eliz Chayter papist. 1724 8 papists. 1766-89 nil returns ?.

Well 1564 Sir Chris Danby papist-minded. c. 1560 Rich Simpson, priest martyr born here. 1569 10 rebels, 43 fined. 1575 Wm Winterscale of Snape Park rect. 1580 1, and Fras Wycliffe gent rect of Snape fled. 1610 Hy Constable papist at school. 1618-9 Thorpe Perrow 2; Nosterfield Mrs Bierley rect. 1620-1 Thorpe 1; Well 3 children of Wm Hargrave gent rectx. 1624-5 Thorpe 2-3. Nosterfield 4. (Tho Bierley gent, Troth Ingleby) 1625 same, Mrs Bierley, Mrs Hopwood. 1626-33 same. 1664-5 Robt Lumley and wife papists. 1670 Robt Lumley, Ralph Errington. 1673-4 3 Lumleys of Well, Ralph Errington gent and wife papists. 1690 2. Jn Nixon to Eng. Coll. Rome. 1722-4 1-2 papists. 1766-89 nil.

(13) HALLIKELD WAPENTAKE

Burneston 1569 78 rebels, 5 executed, 90 fined. 1579 1 rect. 1587 4 non-cts. (Anth Gatenby gent and wife) 1595 3 rectx (Ann wife of Thos Warcopp gent), 2 non-cts. 1597-9 5 rectx. (Mrs Warcop, Fras

Gatenby gent and wife) 1604 7. (Geo Jackson Esq of Gatenby and wife, Fras Strangways, Fras Gatenby gent and wife, Geo Mitchell of Newton gent and wife) 1607 Gatenbys. 1611 Exilby 2 (Jane Mitchell vid), Gatenby 2. 1612 6. 1613 10. (Mitchell) 1614-6 5. (Mrs Mitchell, Hy Warcopp gent) 1621 Mrs Mitchell. 1624 Gatenby: Wm Clapton Esq and wife Lady Ann; Carthorpe 2. 1629 Jane wife of Tho Croft gent, Solomon Mitchell rectx. 1630-3 Mrs Croft. 1641 Fras Mitchell yeoman. 1664-90 nil ? 1743-5 4-5 papists. 1766-89 nil ? 1811 some papists.

Cundall with Leckby 1569 11 rebels, 20 fined. 1590 widow of Cuth Johnson gent rect. 1604 2 non-cts. 1614-9 nil. 1664-71, 1679 nil. 1680 Wm Constable and wife not to church. 1690 nil. 1724 2 papists. 1771 4 papists. 1775 1 fam. 1789 4 papists.

Kirkby Hill 1569 8 rebels, 17 fined, Robt Firbank schoolmaster obst. rect. 1577 nil. 1590-2 Tho Tankard gent and wife rectx, Jas Hebburn gent and wife suspect. 1595 Tankard family and 4 others rectx. 1596-9 3 rectx. (Fras Goodrick) 1600 11. (Tankards, Punsanby, Fras Goodrick, Anth Anderton) 1604 2 (Tho Tankard Esq, Wm Gibson gent), 2 non-cts. 1605-6 5. (Mrs Tankard, Gibsons) 1611-7 Tankards. 1624 8. 1628-9 12. (Tankards) 1630-41 same. 1647 Tankards. 1665-70 12-5 papists. (Tankards) 1674 14. (Tankards, Kath Walgrave) 1681 14. 1690 16. 1724 19. 1745 11. (Tankards) 1766 2 papist fams. 1789?. 1811 1 family of papists.

Kirklington 1561 Mich Wandesford gent suspect. 1569 33 rebels, 1 executed, 30 fined. 1572 Chris Wandesford jun. gent suspect. 1604 1 old woman rect. 1608 1 suspect. 1622 Wm Parker gent suspect non-ct. 1629 Jane Pudsey vid. papist. 1664 The Binlowes gent not to church. 1665 nil. 1673-81 only Quakers. 1690-1724 nil. 1745 Wm Grimston of Howgrave papist. 1766 nil. 1789 nil.

Pickhill with Roxby 1564 Mich Wandesford Esq suspect. 1569 37 rebels (. . . Wandesford gent), 3 executed, 51 fined. 1572 Mich Wandesford suspect. 1602-6 Ric Meynell gent rect. 1611-3 Pickhill 4-5 rectx (Merial wife of Ric Wandesford gent, Mrs Grant, Meynells), Ainderby Quernhow 1. 1614-6 Mrs Grant. 1623 19 rectx. (same Mrs Beckwith, Mrs Frankland, Eliz Wandesford) 1624-5 11-2. (Grant) 1628 2-3. (Mrs Grant, Mrs Eliz Wandesford) 1629 Robt Bierley gent. 1632 5-6. (same gentry) 1641 4. (Grant) 1653 Mrs Grant, 1664 3 papists. (Jane Grant) 1669-73 2. 1679-81 2. 1690 2. 1708 1 fam. 1724 3 papists. 1766 1 fam just left, another just arrived.

West Tanfield 1569 33 rebels, 2 executed, 39 fined. 1604 several non-cts. 1614 1 non-ct. 1616-20 2-3 refts. 1624-5 Mrs Bierley. 1626-7 3. (Thos Bierley gent) 1629 Bierley. 1631-5 Ann wife of Ric Beckwith gent rect. 1652 Tho Bierley. 1670 some papists. 1690 5 papists. 1724 nil. 1766 nil ?.

Wath 1564 Rich Norton Esq suspect. 1569 same, Sampson and Chris Norton, Marm Norton gents rebels, c. 30-40 others, 4 executed, 30 fined. 1580 Cath Bulmer gen' rect. 1591 same. 1595 2. 1604 4 non-cts. 1612-3 1 non-ct. c. 1615 Cath. marriage in Norton Conyers Hall (Musgrave) ? 1620 servant three rect. 1624 2 daus of Tho Croft gent refts. 1625-7 4 refts. (Crofts) 1636 1. 1663 1 papist. 1669-70 Mrs Vodka papist. 1690 nil. 1724 nil. 1766 2 papist fams. (8) 1789 nil?.

(14) GILLING EAST WAPENTAKE

Ainderby Steeple 1569 46 rebels, 69 fined. 1575 Geo Conyers gent suspect. 1577 4 obstinate papists. (Jn Rokeby gent and wife, Wm Markenfield gent, Mr Conyers. 1590 1 suspect. 1593 several refts, 1 in gaol. 1595 2 refts (Cuthbert Witham gent), 1 non-ct. 1601 Robt Fauconbridge rect. 1607-8 Wm Middleton Esq 1616 7. (Ann Middleton, Rich Curwen gent) 1618-9 5-6 refts. (Robt Lascelles gent and wife) 1630 5 refts (Mrs Middleton), 1 non-ct. 1638 1 rect. 1641 5. (Chris Metcalfe gent) 1680 2. 1690 ? 1724 nil. 1744 1 family. 1766, 1789 nil. 1811 2 papist families.

Barton 1569 8 rebels, 13 fined. 1611-8 1-3 refts. 1619 Mrs Pudsey rect. 1625-8 8. (Mich Pudsey gent) 1630-3 12-13. (Mrs Pudsey) 1664-70 1-2 papists. 1675 same. 1690 2. 1724 4. 1744 11 papists. 1766 2 fams. (9) 1789 nil ?.

Bolton on Swale 1590 5 refts. (Jn Scrope gent) 1593 4. (Wm Atkinson gent and wife, Marm Conyers gent, Mrs Thoresby) 1624 5 non-cts. (Mrs Grace Calvert, Mrs Layton) 1627 2 refts, 1 non-ct. 1628 1 rect. 1633 3. (Jn Smithson gent, Mrs Smithson) 1634 3. (Smithsons) 1664-70 4-7 papists. (Smithsons, Geo Wright gent and wife) 1690 nil. 1724 nil. 1766 7 papists. 1789 1 papist family.

Cleasby 1564 Jn Cleasby suspect. 1569 8 rebels (Geo Norton gent), 8 fined. 1602 Jn Jenison gent rect. 1611-2 12 refts (Ralph Rokeby gent, Cleasbys, Geo Lambert gent), 2 non-cts (Cleasbys) 1615-6 same. 1618 3. (Lambert) 1623-8 3-6 refts. (Lambert) 1632 Mrs Cleasby. 1637 4. (Anth Bulmer gent and wife) 1639 10. 1641 13. (Fras Tunstall Esq, Lambert, Bulmer, Cleasby) 1665-6 3-4 refts. 1674 12. (Eliz

Pudsey, Mrs Place, Jane Place) 1690 12 papists. 1724 no return. 1744 1 fam. 1766, 1789 ?.

East Cowton 1569 30 rebels, 22 fined. 1597-9 Brian Smithson rect. 1624 nil. 1664-6 2 papists. 1670 1. 1673 6 papists. (John Pepper gent) 1690 1 1724 1. 1766 none in last 10 years. 1791 1 papist.

Croft 1564 Mrs Strickland suspect. 1569 10 rebels, 9 fined. 1593 1 rect. 1595 4 (Hy Pudsey gent, Mrs Burnett), 1 other rect. 1598-9 same. 1601 1 rect. 1607-8 2. 1611-2 10. (Mrs Burnett, Pudseys, Margt wife of Rowland Dodsworth) 1614-6 6, with 10 at Dalton. (Geo Lambert gent and wife, Mrs Burnett, Mrs Cleasby), Stapleton: Hy Pudsey gent. 1616 Mrs Dodsworth. 1621-2 4. (Mrs Pudsey) 1624 11. (Burnett) 1629-32 Pudsey, Burnett. 1641 2. 1654 Ralph Pudsey gent. 1669 5 papists. (Ann Trotter) 1673-81 3-4. 1690, 1724 ? 1744 4 families of papists. 1766 1 fam. 1789 4 papists.

Danby Wiske 1569 14 rebels, 18 fined. 1575 2 rectx. (Jn Rokeby gent) 1579 Marm Conyers gent rect. 1580-1 Jn Rokeby gent. 1583 same. 1590 9. (Mrs Conyers, Mrs Beilby) 1593 Geo Conyers gent. 1595 6 (Conyers) rectx, 5 non-ctx. 1601 3. (same) 1604 11 (same), 10 non-ctx. 1607 Conyers. 1611-2 8 rectx, 4 non-ctx. 1614 Mrs Robinson. 1616-21 4. (Ric Best gent and wife) 1627 Marm Conyers gent non-ctx. 1632 2-3 rectx. (Mrs Gatenby) 1664-81 nil. 1690 ? 1724 nil. 1744 6 papists. 1754 6. 1766 Danby: 4, Yafforth 12. 1789 4 papists.

Kirkby Wiske 1562 Fras Lascelles Esq suspect. 1566-9 Chris Lascelles suspect. 35 rebels, 75 fined. 1571 Fras Lascelles Esq rect. 1587 4 rectx. 1590-5 Fras Lascelles and wife. 1605 1. 1607 Wm Lascelles Esq. 1611-4 5-8 (Lascelles, Gatenby) 3-4 non-ctx. 1616-8 5-6 rectx. (same) 1620-1 4. (same) 1627 11. (Gatenby) 1630-41 6-7 rectx. (same) 1664-5 some papists. 1673 2. 1675-81 11. (Edw Saltmarsh gent and fam., Faith Blackiston) 1690 7. 1717 Saltmarshes. 1724 ? 1744 1. 1766, 1789 ?

Great Langton 1569 15 rebels, 14 fined. 1575 Chris Conyers gent rect. 1600 1. 1604 Mrs Cleasby. 1606 2. 1607 Mrs Crosby. 1614 Tho Pudsey gent and wife. 1625-6 2. (Mrs Pudsey) 1665-70 nil. 1673-9 ? 1690, 1724 nil. 1766 4 papists. 1791 1.

Manfield 1569 10 rebels, 13 fined. 1577 Anth Witham suspect. 1580 2. (Jas Rokeby Esq, Wm Thoresby Esq) 1590 1 rect. 1593 3-5. (Witham) 1595 6. (Nortons) 1597-1602 23 rectx. (Withams) 1604 c. 20. 1606 19. 1607 Ann Witham vid. 1611-2 20-23. (Nortons, Withams, Mrs Tindall) 1614 21. 1616 24. (Witham, Geo Metcalfe

gent) 1628 12-15. (same) 1633 same. 1634 Wm Wormeley gent. 26 rectx. 1641 28. 1650 Withams. 1666-9 9 papists. (Withams, Robt Wilson gent, Eliz Wilson) 1679-80 30. 1690 Cliffe: 25 papists (Withams), Manfield 76 papists. (Jn Clayton gent, Solomon Swale and wife, Mrs Metham, Dorothy Wyvill) 1724 121 papists. (Eliz Salkeld vid, Withams) 1743-5 42 heads of papist families. 1766 114 papists. (Witham, Mary Tunstall) 1789 60. 1811 40.

Middleton Tyas 1569 25 fined. (Wm Franke) 1587 Cath Bulmer gen' rect. 1590 c. 17 rectx. (Mrs Margt Frank, 3 other Franks) 1593 Franks, Brian Smithson. 1595 9 rectx, 2 non-ctxs. (Mr Franke) 1598 same. 1604 21 rectx. (Frankes) 1611 30. 1614 16. (Franke, Smithson) 1624-6 12. (same) 1633 33 rectx, 2 non-ctxs, 60 negligent to church. 1641 40. (Franke, Tho Tocketts gent) 1664-5 23 papists. (Frank) 1670 16. (Frank, Nich Salkeld gent and wife) 1673 8 papists. (Frank) 1675 12-3. (Anchotell Bulmer gent and wife) 1679-81 6. (Bulmers) 1690 Calvert Smithson gent. 1708 1 fam. 1744-5 3-4 papists. 1759 3 families. 1766 same. 1771-6 2 fams. 1789 nil. 1811 15 papists.

Great Smeaton 1569 3 rebels, 3 fined. 1578 2 rectx, 2 suspects. 1593 nil. 1616 8 rectx. 1619 Mary wife of Anth Appleby gent. 1622-4 7-8. (Granges) 1625-7 Chris Grange gent and fam., Ralph Conyers gent. 1630 5 (Mrs Appleby) 1633 7 (Grange, Appleby), 2 non-ctxs. 1633-41 5-6 rectx. 1665 9 papists. 1669 7. 1670 4. 1674 6. 1690 nil. 1744 1 family. 1766, 1789 ?.

(15) GILLING WEST WAPENTAKE

Arkengarthdale 1569 2 rebels. 1614-6 2 rectx. (Barninghams) 1624 2. 1628 1. 1633 1. 1669 c. 10 papists. 1680 8. (Barninghams) 1708 12 papists disarmed. (mostly Barninghams) 1724 no return. 1744 4 families. 1766 ? 1789 1 papist.

Barningham 1572 Fras Tunstall Esq conforms. 1590 nil. 1595 5 rectx. (Tunstalls, Ann Salvin gen') 1601-2 5-6 rectx, 1 non-ctx. (Tunstall) 1604 22 rectx. (same, Cuth Pudsey gent) 1611 9. 1619 3. (Mrs Tunstall) 1621 Jn Claxton Esq and wife. 1624 14. (Tunstall, Mrs Maddison) 1641 14. (Tunstalls, Frances Radcliffe) 1664-5 5-7 papists. (Anth Metcalfe gent and wife) 1669 5-6, 1673-9 Fras Tunstall Esq and wife. 1690 8. (Metcalfes) 1708 Robt Collingwood papist. 1716 same. 1724 21 papists. 1744 6 fams. 1766 4 papists. 1770-4 2 fams. 1789 no return. 1811 3 papists.

Bowes 1569 1 rebel. 1578 1 rect, 1 non-ctx. 1587 4 non-ctxs. (Mrs

Ward) 1593 Robt Ward rect gaoled. 1595 1 1604 1. 1608 1. 1612-6 1 rect, 3 non-cts. 1623 2. 1641 2 papists. 1664-5 nil. 1669 6 'convicted rectx' ? 1673 4 popish rectx. 1690 ? 1763 1 family of papists. 1766 nil. 1789 2 papists. 1811 7 papists.

Brignall 1604 2 non-cts. 1619-29 1 rect. 1630-4 1-3 rectx. 1690 nil. 1724 1 papist. 1744 3. 1766 5. 1789 5 papists.

Easby 1569 10 rebels, 10 fined. 1587 Isabel Dalton rect. 1590 2 non-cts. (Mrs Barton) 1592 1 rect. 1595 2 non-cts. 1604 1 rect, 1 non-ct. 1611-6 Brompton 1 rect. 1624-6 Skeeby 1-3 rectx. 1631 Brompton, wife of Jas Cleasby gent rect. 1633 Skeeby 5 rectx. 1641 Brompton 8. 1665 12 papists. (Fras Tunstall gent and wife) 1670-1 1-2. 1690 Skeeby 2 papists, Brompton 3. 1724 10 papists. 1744 15. (Wm Strickland) 1759 2 fams. 1766 Brompton 16 papists (Mrs Harland), Easby Hill 1, Skeeby 2. 1789 50 papists. 1811 2 papist families.

Forcett 1569 7 rebels. 1571 Thos and Stephen Pudsey rectx. 1573 Tho Pudsey Esq. 1576 same. 1587 Forcett: 3 rectx, Eppleby 10, Barforth 14 (Mrs Pudsey vid.), Ovington 1. (28) 1590-1 33. (Pudseys) 1595 42. (same) 1604 16 rectx, 20 non-cts, 11 others new non-cts. (49) 1608-11 11. 1614 23. (Pudseys) 1616 27. 1624 39. (Chris Metcalfe gent and wife) 1630 60 rectx. 1633 67. (Metcalfes of Carkin) 1638 Dorothy Metham vid. 1641 Forcett: 22, Eppleby: 24, Carkin: 5 (Metcalfes), Ovington: 3, Barforth 14, with another 13 new rectx. (81; Jn Catterick gent, Bridget Catterick, Fras Lowick vid) 1664-5—various sources give 44, 62, 25 popish rectx. (Pudseys) 1669 40 papists. (Pudseys, Fras Tunstall gent and wife) 1670 same. 1673-81 c. 22. (Pudseys) 1690 Barforth 11 (Pudseys), Forcett 16, Ovington 11 (38). 1716 4 fams. 1744 12 papists on bond. 1766 Forcett 1 papist, Carkin 6, Carleton 9, Eppleby 19, Ovington 14 (49). 1789 41 1811 40 papists.

Gilling 1569 8 rebels, 12 fined. 1575-81 Jane wife of Ric Gascoigne of Sedbury Esq rect. 1584 nil. 1591-3 7 rectx. (Mrs Jane Gascoigne) 1595 2 (same), 3 non-cts. 1604 Mrs Gascoigne vid rect, 3 non-cts. 1611 11 rectx. 1614 same. 1624 Eryholme 3 rectx (Wm Burnett gent), Gilling wife of Fras Thorpe gent rect. 1630 same. 1632 Mrs Burnett rect. 1641 Gilling Alice Gower vid rect, Scales 5 rectx. 1664 Eryh. 7 papists, Gilling 2. 1667 same. 1670 same. 1675-9 3-4. 1690 6 at Eryholme. 1708 5 men papists. 1717 Jn Forster gent. (4) 1724 8 (?) 1766 Cowton Hall Farm 1 fam., Gilling 3 papists. 1789 9 at S. Cowton. 1811 1 papist family.

Hutton Magna 1569 1 rebel, Fras Layton of W. Layton fined. 1587

1 rect at W. Layton. 1590 5 rectx. 1593-5 11. (Mrs Hussey, Fras Wycliffe gent) 1604 5 rectx, 1 non-ct. 1611 10 rectx. (Tunstalls) 1612 Tho Layton gent rect. 1614 9. (Mrs Tunstall, Mrs Willaunce vid) 1616 Tho Layton jun gent rect. 1626 9 rectx. (Laytons, Willans, Alice Wyvill vid) 1635 5. (Layton) Ann Metham. 1639-41 8-9 popish rectx. (Laytons, Mathams) 1655 Wm Tunstall. 1666-9 5 papists. (Tunstall) 1673-81 c. 14 papists. 1690 7. 1708 Hutton 3 papists disarmed, Laytons 5. 1716 Hutton 7, Laytons 4. 1744 Hutton 14 papists, Laytons 11. 1766 47 papists. 1789 56 papists, who are employed by Fras Tunstall Esq. 1811 70 papists.

Kirkby Ravensworth 1569 15 rebels. 1577 widow Wycliffe obst. papist. 1579 1 rect. 1587 5. (Smithsons) 1590 5 rectx (same), 3 non-cts. (Mr Anderton and wife) 1593 Gayles Ann Layton vid. Mrs Layton rectx, 1595 10 rectx. (Mrs Layton) 1601 3. (. . . Punsanby of Whashton) 1604 19 (Punsanby, Ric Meynell gent, Jn Smithson gent), 10 non-cts. (Beale Wycliffe, Agnes Layton) 1611 8. 1614 10. (Meynells) 1616 16. (same, Punsanby, Layton, Mrs Pudsey) 1623 25. 1628 Wm Clapton gent and wife Lady Anne. 1630 59 rectx. (same, Anthony Trotter and wife, Mich Norton and wife) 1633 41. 1641 43. (Meynell, Nich Allen gent and wife) 1664 48 papists. (Allen) 1665 90 papists. 1669 51. 1674 Ravensworth 20, Dalton 35 (Meynells, Trinian Anderson gent and fam., Geo Anderson gent), Newsham 16 (Smithsons), Whashton 27 (Allens) (98). 1675 63 papists. 1679 53. 1680 Wm Collingwood gent and wife, Jn Smithson gent. 1690 73. (Meynells, Smithsons) 1716 12 fams. 1724 100 papists. 1744 17 men refused Oaths. (Mich Tunstall Esq) 1766 Dalton 24, Gayles 2, Newsham 12, Whashton 1 (39). 1789 40. 1811 80.

Marrick 1564 Anth Catterick Esq suspect. 1590 1 rect. 1595 2. 1599-1601 5. (Anth Holtby gent, Mrs Thuresbie) 1611-6 1. 1619 5. 1625 5 rectx, 1 non-ct. 1632-5 14. (wife of Alphonsus Bulmer gent, Wm Bulmer Esq and wife, Eliz Sayer, wife of Anth Frankland gent from Wensley) 1636 Wm Conyers gent and wife. 1664-5 11 papists (Bulmers) 1669-70 11. 1673-5 10. 1679-81 3. 1690 5. 1716 2. 1724, 1766 nil. 1789 nil.

Marske 1571-3 Robt Rokeby gent and servant rectx, gaoled. 1580 Roger Gower gent and fam. rectx. 1590 2. 1593 2. 1612 3. (Ralph Rokeby Esq and wife) 1614 nil. 1624 8 non-cts. 1630 1 non-ct. 1664-5 nil. 1669 Fras Hutton vid. rect (?) 1690, 1724 nil. 1766 nil, 'none perverted for 30 years.' 1789 no return, but Niles Stapleton Esq and household here from 1768. 1786-90 at least 6 fams. of papists.

Melsonby 1569 10 rebels, 11 (Wm Gaterd) fined. 1590 3 rectx (Robt Gaterd), 1 suspect. 1595 Eliz wife of Rob Gaterd rect. 1602 Gaterds. 1604 27 rectx (Gaterds, Margery Gower), 2 non-ctxs (Edw Gower). 1605-6 10. (same) 1611 16. (same) 1612-4 same. 1616 same. 1624 18. (Mr Gaterd's fam. moved to Aldborough) 1627 9. (Gaterd, Gower) 1632 11. (Gower) 1636-9 2-3. 1655 1. 1664-5 12-13 papists. 1669 same. (Jn Bulmer gent and wife) 1675-81 c. 12 papists. 1690 12. 1716 7 refused Oaths. (Mrs Margt Leach) 1724 14. 1766 5. 1789 3 papists. 1811 7.

Rokeby 1564 Robt Rokeby Esq suspect. 1572 Chris Rokeby gent suspect. 1585 Mr Rokeby rect. 1586 Jn Rokeby rect. 1590 5 rectx (Rokeby, Wm Pudsey gent), 1 non-ctx. 1592-5 6-7 Rokebys rectx. 1597 same. 1604 4 (Lady Rokeby), 3 non-ctxs. (Sir Tho Rokeby) 1611 4. 1616 4. 1620-2 2. 1626 6. (Wm Clapton gent of Mortham and wife Lady Ann) 1629 4. 1633 5-6. (Ralph Rokeby gent) 1641 1-2. 1664-5 nil. 1680 Thos Witham gent of Mortham, Mary Witham papists. 1690 Withams. 1716 1 papist. 1724 2. 1744 1. 1766 nil ? 1772 1 family. 1789 nil.

Romaldkirk 1569 16 fined. 1581 1 rect. 1590 nil. 1604 3 rectx. (Mrs Franke) 1611-2 2. (Jane wife of Ferdinando Huddleston Esq of Thwaites) 1613 same. 1614-9 5-6. 1621 1. 1624 nil. 1626 3. (Mrs Appleby of Lartington) 1628 6-7 (same), 4 non-ctxs. 1630-3 7 rectx, 4 non-ctxs. (Applebys) 1641 5. (Mrs Huddleston) 1655 Applebys. 1665 1 papist. 1669 24 'convicted rectx' (?) (Robt Bolron at Lartington) 1674 5 papists. 1690 ? 1716-7 Thos Maire Esq. 1724 20 papists. (Maires) 1743-5 13 refused Oaths. (Maire) 1747 Maires. 1766 Lartington 28, The Cragg 5, Cotherstone 5 (Ann Appleby), Romaldkirk 1 (39). 1789 Henry Maire and his domestics. 1811 23 papist families; priest makes converts.

Stanwick St John 1564 Anth Catterick Esq suspect. 1569 Robt Lambert, Rich Meynell gents rebels, 6 fined. 1572 Anth Catterick papist. 1575 Robt Lambert gent rect. 1577 Anth Catterick Esq shelters 2-3 rectx. 1580 Anth and Geo Catterick rectx. 1586 Mrs Scrope. 1590 12 rectx. (Catterick) 1591 Mrs Scrope, Mrs Lambert. 1593 Stanwick 8 (Catterick, Lambert), Aldborough 18 (Mrs Crosby), E. Layton 1, Caldwell 3 (30). 1595 29. (Anth Metcalfe gent and wife) 1599 Jennison gent. 1600 Cattericks, Metcalfes. 1604 52 (same with Nic Metham, Lamberts), 55 non-ctxs. 1611 62. 1614 Kath Constable vid, Dorothy Metham vid. 1616 65. (Cattericks, Ambrose Pudsey and wife, Metcalfes) 1623-4 86. 1630 65. (Wm Pennington gent) 1632 Metcalfes. 1636 Wm

Witham gent and wife. 1641 91 rectx (Catterick, Metcalfe, Pennington) and 22 others (113). 1664-5 65 papists. (Catterick, Metcalfe) 1670 48. (Meynells, Metcalfes, Edw Birbeck gent) 1674 66. (same) 1675 Thos Gurlington gent. 1680 Tho Pudsey gent and wife Lucy. 1690 71 papists. (Sir Hugh Smithson, Mary Gurlington) 1724 72. 1728 Ric Aspinwall gent and wife. 1753 same. 1766 59 papists. (same) 1789 12. 1791-2 Mich Errington gent of Carlton and 5 other papist families. 1811 30 papists.

Startforth 1578 1 non-ct. 1587 same. 1621-5 1-2 rectx. 1630 10 rectx (?) 1664-5 nil. 1670-5 Thos Bulmer gent and wife papists. 1679 same. 1690 5 papists. (Kath Bulmer) 1708 1. 1724 9. 1744-5 1-2. 1766 nil. 1789 1 papist family.

Wycliffe 1564 Wm Wycliffe Esq suspect. 1575 Fras Wycliffe gent rect. 1580 Wm Wycliffe Esq non-ct. 1583 same. 1584-5 2 Wycliffe rectx. 1591 4 rectx. (Wycliffes, Gurlingtons) 1592-5 3-5. (Wycliffe, Christian Ward vid gen') 1602 4. 1604 2 rectx (Wycliffe), 7 non-cts (Gurlington), 2 other Gurlingtons rectx. 1606-10 Fras Wycliffe gent rect in gaol. 1611-2 4. (Geo Smithson gent) 1616 4. 1629 2. (Wm Waistell gent) 1632 Mrs Tunstall. 1638-41 3 rectx. (Tunstall) 1663 Tunstalls. 1669 Tho Cholmley and wife, Mrs Tunstall, Geo Markham gent and wife. 1674 4. (Tunstalls) 1690 14 papists. (Tunstalls, Ralph Crathorne gent and wife) 1717 Rich Skelton Esq. 1744 15 refused Oaths (Tunstall) 1766 no return. 1785 confirmation of 38 here, with 130 communicants. 1789 50 papists.

Appendix II

MS. Sources for the History of North Riding Catholic Recusancy

In addition to the central governmental, local civil government and Anglican official archive sources listed at the head of Appendix I, there are:

A. Archives of Catholic Institutions

1. Leeds Diocesan Archives

Hogarth MSS (nineteenth-century transcripts of Yorkshire Brethren records, mission records, a few personal papers of priests c. 1650ff.); private wills of Northern Vicars Apostolic and Hugh Appleby of Linton, N. Riding; diary of Northern Vicar Apostolic, 1792-7; Linton, N. Riding, Mission Account Book; deeds of Tancred family of Brampton, N. Riding (eighteenth century).

2. Birmingham Diocesan Archives

Papers of the Linton mission, 1730's (A/13, 1058); the case of Lord Fauconberg, 1730's (A/8. 115, 164, 172, 175-9); private bequests of John Bellasis, 1716 (A/202); Scrope pedigree and descent of estate (C/113-4); bequests of Mrs Yate, Gilling, N. Riding, 1707 (C/204); letter of Mary Witham, 1748 (A/518); Instruction by Bishop Walton to N. District faithful (A/1145).

3. Hexham and Newcastle Diocesan Archives

Roydon MSS, ff. 281ff., private instructions of Thos. Rawdon, a N. Riding priest in 1700. Connected papers, including correspondence with Bishop Dicconson at Wycliffe, N. Riding, in 1740's.

4. Westminster Archives

W.A. xxxv, pp. 21ff., lists of those confirmed in N. Riding by Bishop Leyburne, 1687.

5. Upholland College Library

Bannister Correspondence—letters, 1786, on imprisonment of Dom Anselm Bolton of Gilling, N. Riding, in York Castle.

6. Ushaw College Library

Ushaw and Eyre MSS, *passim*, on seventeenth-eighteenth centuries, N. Province; Register of Northern Vicars Apostolic from 1750's.

7. Jesuit Archives

Farm Street—lists of missionaries of the Society of Jesus by colleges; deeds of Richmond mission. Stonyhurst—Anglia and Collectanea MSS, of which pretty well all of significance on Yorks. recusancy was printed by Foley.

8. Benedictine Archives

Downside Abbey—N. Province, O.S.B., records, c.1640ff., Ampleforth Abbey—Meynell of N. Kilvington, N. Riding, family MSS (2 vols.); Bolton MSS and a few Fairfax of Gilling MSS.

9. Franciscan Archives

Forest Gate Friary, London—O.F.M. Yorks, mission records.

10. Convent Archives

See list in Aveling, *The Catholic Recusants of the West Riding*, p. 185.

B. Family Archives

ALLEN of Spennithorne deeds (in Topham MSS, *NRRO*); APPLEBY of Linton deeds (in Trappes MSS, *penes* Trappes-Lomax family); BELLASIS of Newburgh (Lords FAUCONBERG) (Wombwell MSS, Newburgh Priory); CHOLMLEY of Brandsby (quite a large collection, held by the Fairfax-Cholmley family); CHOLMLEY of Whitby (parts in *NRRO*, useless for recusancy; parts will soon be in *ERRO*); CRATHORNE of Crathorne (*inter* MSS of Sir Thos. Lionel Dugdale, *NRRO*—a small but useful collection); CALVERT of Kiplin (Lords BALTIMORE) (fragments in Kiplin and Turner MSS, *NRRO*; bulk are the Calvert Papers, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, U.S.A.; letters in Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments; Strafford Correspondence, *SCL*); CONSTABLE of Kirkby Knowle (Constable of Burton Constable MSS, *ERRO*); DANBY of Masham (a large collection, Swinton MSS, Cartwright Hall, Bradford); FAIRFAX of Gilling (Lords FAIRFAX of Emley) (large collection, bulk *inter* Wombwell MSS at Newburgh Priory; fragments scattered in Bodleian, Oxford; *BM*; York Minster Library); FAIRFAX of Dunsley (fragments amongst Fairfax of Gilling MSS, and some deeds for sale in 1962 as part of Lord Effingham's MSS by Winifred Myers Ltd., Bond St.); HOWARD of Naworth, Brafferton, Castle Howard (Naworth MSS, Prior's Kitchen, Durham; Earl of Carlisle's MSS, Castle Howard); LAWSON of Brough

(large collection at Brough Hall); MAYES-MAIRE-FERMOR of Yarm (bits in Lawson MSS and Meynell MSS); MEYNELL of N. Kilvington (large collection recently deposited in NRRO; 2 vols. of recusancy papers in Ampleforth Abbey Library); PUDSEY of Barforth and Hackforth (Pudsey deeds, *YASL*; Pudsey Book of Hours with obits. *penes* Miss Littledale, Oxford); RADCLIFFE of Stearsby (papers belonging to Mr Radcliffe of Kiplin Hall); STAPLETON of Aiskew, Bedale (Stapleton of Carlton MSS, *ERRO*); STRICKLAND of Thornton Bridge, Catterick and Richmond (Strickland of Sizergh MSS, Sizergh Castle; also two bundles of papers *inter* Scrope MSS); SCROPE of Bolton (Lords SCROPE) and of Danby (Scrope MSS, Danby Hall; MSS of Lord Bolton); SWALE of Grinton (Swale MSS, NRRO); SMITH of Egton Bridge (MSS *penes* Turnbull family, Cardiff); SMITHSON of Newsham and Stanwick (?Duke of Northumberland's MSS at Alnwick Castle and Syon House); TANCRED of Brampton (Tancred MSS, Leeds Diocesan Archives; Tancred MSS, *YASL*—all of eighteenth century only); TOPHAM of Agglethorpe (Craven-Smith-Milnes Collection, Topham of Middleham MSS, NRRO—of little use for recusancy); TUNSTALL of Scargill (*inter* Constable of Burton Constable MSS, *ERRO*); WORSLEY of Hovingham (Worsley MSS, Hovingham Hall, supplemented by letters in Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*); WIDDRINGTON of Nunnington (MSS of Lord O'Hagan, Widdrington MSS, Lancs. City Record Office, Preston); WANDESFORD of Kirklington (?bits printed in McCall, *History of the House of Wandesford*); WITHAM of Cliffe (?papers of present Witham family).

C. *Miscellaneous Sources*

1. At *PRO*—State Papers, Domestic (*SP*), *passim*, numerous details; Star Chamber cases (many illuminating details, e.g., SC. 8/11/12, Attorney General v. Richard Heaton of Wetherby, gent., a famous informer against recusants; SC. 8/24/1, Attorney General v. Thos. Pudsey, gent., of Hackforth, N. Riding, a Catholic barrister skilled in evasions of recusancy laws; SC. 8/104/15, 8/12/11, etc., some of the numerous legal battles between Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby of Hackness and the Cholmleys of Whitby; SC. 8/175/4, enormous case of Hoby against the entire East Riding bench; very revealing on working of Yorks. Jacobean Justices; SC. 8/275/6, vicar of Grinton charging churchwardens with refusal to present recusants; their countercharge of Puritanism); Court of Wards—e.g., Wards, 9/220, f. 55, 1640–2, Catholic Fairfax ward taken from mother and sent to Protestant

school; Chancery cases—e.g., C. 2449/12, 13, 16—1721 suit of Dom George Fairfax v. Charles, Viscount Fairfax, revealing Benedictine mission finances.

2. At *BM*—Lansdowne MSS, *passim*, especially MS 153 on Oath of Allegiance and recusancy fining; Add. MSS, *passim*, odd letters of Yorks. gentry.

3. York City Archives (Public Library, York), *passim*, for N. Riding residents there; eighteenth century York newspapers (especially *York Courant*).

4. Printed books, with MS inscriptions, obits., etc., e.g., Ampleforth Abbey Library—numerous books of N. Riding O.S.B. missionaries; fragments of Fairfax library at Gilling Castle; most of O.S.B. Northern Provincial library (seventeenth century); MS Book of Hours of Tophams of Agglethorpe, N. Riding, with obits. Bishop of Middlesbrough—Confessor's book of cases belonging to Nicholas Postgate, Egton Bridge Presbytery—book belonging to Thos. Thweng, priest; MS book of seventeenth century Catholic sermons. Croxdale Hall Library, Durham—Catherine de Strom's prayer-book, with obits., eighteenth century at Cliffe, N. Riding.

Index

- Acklam, 52, 180, 268; incidence of recusancy, 420
- Acrigg, John (d. 1585), career, 27-8
- Actors, Catholic, 288-91
- Adams, Peter (*alias* Watson), apostate priest, 386-7
- Addison family, 270, 275, 359
- Addison, Scholastica, nun, 393
- Agar family, 54-5, 88, 103
- Agglethorpe, Tophams and, 262, 308
- Ainderby Steeple, 21, 63, 82; incidence of recusancy, 92, 174, 434
- Aiskew, 84; Hall, 389; Mass-house, 378
- Aislaby, 63, 182, 310
- Aislaby family, 182, 183, 269, 356
- Aldborough, 289, 305, 322, 334, 345; Metcalfes and, 170, 217, 232, 259, 353; Catholic gentry, 355, 396, 399; chapel, 389
- Allanby, Robert, 149
- Allanson, Mrs Jane, recusancy composition, 279
- Allanson, Thomas, 279
- Allanson, William, priest, 332
- Allanson, Sir William, J. P., 305
- Allanson, Lady, remarriage, 305
- Allen family, 353, 359, 388, 396, 399, 400
- Allen, William, priest, 48
- Allen, William (1532-94), Cardinal, 44, 46, 52, 68, 75, 105, 113; and seminary priests, 34-5, 158; career in England, 36-7, 53, 60; and conservative priests, 53; and Gower, 56-7; ordained priest, 290, 108 n. 31
- Allerston, 290; incidence of recusancy, 417
- Allertonshire, 36, 37, 45, 60, 215, 303; Church ownership, 62; landowners, 63, 178; and the Rising, 81; incidence of recusancy, 95, 99, 105, 147, 418-20; Catholic gentry, 178-9, 266-7, 355, 396; foray against superstitions, 275; 'jigs', 289; Sequestration Committee, 314; Meynell estate, 315, 326; Catholic congregations, 394
- Alleyn, Mrs, 271
- Alne, 63, 81, 273; incidence of recusancy, 411
- Amotherby, 189, 246, 272
- Ampleforth, 24, 400; Fairfaxes and, 373; monastic library, 386; incidence of recusancy, 409
- Anderson family, 353, 399, 400
- Anderson, Sir Henry, buys Long Cowton, 261
- Anderson, Mary, nun, 393
- Anderson, Nicholas, Catholic schoolmaster, 177
- Anderson, William, missionary priest, 37
- Anderton, Sir Francis, 394
- Anderton, Captain Matthew, 308
- Andrews, John, priest, 331-2
- Anglican Church, shortage of clergy, 33-4; and 'old' priests, 34; and the teaching of a faith, 49; recusants and her services, 87-8; and clandestine marriage, 149-50; and religious persecution, 200; attitude to Catholics, 364-5, 379
- Angram, 336, 397, 398; missionary district, 382; Mass-house, 392
- Angram Grange (Coxwold), 52, 80, 229, 268, 322; (Welbury), 185-6, 194, 274
- Anlaby, William, martyr, 163
- Anne family, 277
- Anne, George, S. J., 237
- Anne, Michael, 326
- Apostolicum Ministerium*, 384
- Appleby family, of Clove Lodge, 259-60, of Lartington, 242, 259, 266, 336; of Linton, 295, 313, 332, 346, 357, 390
- Appleby, Ambrose, 260

- Appleby, Hugh, 346, 390
 Appleby, Robert Paulinus, missionary priest, 241, 242
 Applegarth, 100
 Appleton, 21, 190, 269
 Appleton-le-Street, 189; incidence of recusancy, 409
 Appleton Wiske, 275, 290, 402; Catholic congregations, 257, incidence of recusancy, 269, 270, 420
 Archdeacons' Courts, and repression of Catholics, 147, 378
 Archiepiscopal surveys, 147-8, 378-80, 395-6
 Archpriests, appointment of, 235
 Arden, Tankards and, 122, 143, 154, 185, 203, 204, 212
 Arkendale, 48
 Arkengarthdale, sold to City of London, 258; incidence of recusancy, 436
 Armitage, Sir Francis, Protestant, 264
 Arundel family, 284
 Arundel, Henry Fitzalan, Earl of (?1511-80), 65
 Arundel House, 343
 Ascough, 270
 Ascough, Mrs, 277
 Ashley family, 270
 Ashley, William, 189
 Aske, 206
 Askrigg, 21, 48, 203
 Aspinwall family, 396, 400
 Assizes, and Catholic recusants, 14, 17, 122-5, 169
 Atherton, Sir John, 188
 Atkinson family, 173
 Atkinson, Anthony, clerical tutor, 35
 Atkinson, Ninian ('Sir Ninny Atkinson'), 45
 Atkinson, Stephen, master-mariner, 402
 Atkinson, Thomas, martyr, 173
 Atkinson, William, 173
 Atkinson, William (s. of above), priest and informer, 173
 Audae, John, 371
 Augustinian Canonesses, 253, 256, 351
 Ayscough family, 336, 354, 357; forced sale, 311-12
 Ayscough, Allen, 280-1
 Ayscough, Francis, 309
 Aysgarth, 29, 30, 32, 41, 159, 263; concealment of Catholic monuments, 21; and the Rising, 81-2, 83, 84; incidence of recusancy, 89, 175, 428; Catholic congregations, 257, 393; sale of Crown lands, 261-2; Catholic families, 402
 Ayton, 80
 Ayton Magna, 47
 Babthorpe family, 194, 253, 254, 271
 Babthorpe, Lady, 167, 256
 Babthorpe, Sir William, 60, recusancy fines, 129; and Justices, 207
 Bagdale Hall, 182
 Bagshawe, Christopher (d. ?1625), 165
 Bainton, Robert, Protestant, 76
 Baker, Fr. Augustine, Benedictine, 250-1; *Sancta Sophia*, 359
 Balk, 318
 Baltimore, George Calvert, 1st Baron (?1580-1632), 177, 209-10, 217, 221, 224, 320; supports the regulars, 248; acquires Danby Wiske, 261; buys Kiplin Hall, 265
 Bambrough, Sir William, J.P., 203, 282
 Baptisms, clandestine, 148, 213, 214
 Barden, 153; Thoresbys and, 175, 212, 263
 Barforth, 44; Pudseys and, 99, 116, 135, 171, 246, 247, 259, 309, 353
 Barforth in Forcett, 92, 171
 Barker, Edmund, curate, 47
 Barker, William, curate, 36
 Barmston, 203, 261, 273, 280
 Barnard Castle, 27, 403
 Barnbow, 329
 Barnbrough, 35, 79; Mores and, 229, 403
 Barnes, Thomas, parson, 51
 Barningham, 81; Tunstalls and, 292, 297, 329; incidence of recusancy, 170, 436
 Barrow, Fr., S.J., 395
 Barry, Robert, 318
 Barton, 21, 350; incidence of recusancy, 434
 Barton-le-Street, incidence of recusancy, 409
 Barton family, 187, 246, 278, 309, 349, 357
 Barton, Mrs Ann, recusant wife, 171, 172
 Barton, Edward, 99, 103
 Barton, Thomas, 172
 Basedale, 72, 310
 Battersby in Cleveland, 63, 154
 Baynes, Christopher, 103
 Baynes, William, runaway papist, 31, 42-3
 Beckwith family, 305, 354, 355
 Beckwith, Captain Arthur, 305
 Beckwith, Christopher, deprived priest, 27, 47
 Beckwith, Leonard and wife, 173, 307
 Beckwith, Captain Matthew, J.P., 305
 Beckwith, Mrs, nun, 351
 Beckwith, Sir Roger, J.P., 322, 333, 336, 355
 Bedale, 21, 32, 47, 144, 176, 295, 318, 327, 328, 343, 345, 389; and the Rising, 82, 83; Catholic congregations, 257; Catholic numbers, 393; Catholic families, 396, 400, 402; incidence of recusancy, 430-1
 Beeston, 73

- Beilby family, 272
 Bell family, freeholders, 402
 Bell, Henry, 48; and Holtby, 165
 Bell, Thomas, 21, 53, 136; his career, 28, 151-2, 165; Tirry and, 30; Memoirs, 48, 106, 151-2; missionary, 57; Mass visitation of York Castle, 151; apostasy, 151-2, 166; group leader, 158
 Bellasis family, 27, 81, 190, 229, 336, 359-60, 396; landowners, 184-5, 272-3; marriages, 273; women, 393
 Bellasis, Anthony, 185, 401
 Bellasis, Henry, s. of Lord Fauconberg, 228, 229, 230, 273, 274, 308; *Custos Rotulorum*, 234
 Bellasis, Sir Henry, s. of Sir William, 118, 186; Councillor of the North, 202, 206; sheriff, 210; baronet, 273
 Bellasis, James, 185
 Bellasis, John Bellasis, Baron (1614-89), 273, 274; Governor of Hull, 319
 Bellasis, Sir Rowland, s. of Henry, 274, 334, 336, 357
 Bellasis, Sir Thomas, 183, 185, 204, 273
 Bellasis, Sir William, 83, 98, 104, 118, 193, 273
 Belt, Mrs, widow, 352, 357
 Belwood family, 400
 Benedictines, 166; Bishop and, 235, 250; English mission and missionaries, 239-40, 249, 318, 341, 342, 345, 350; 'Cassinese' and 'Spaniards', 239-40; oddities among, 250-1; apostates, 251; communities for women, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 351-2, 393; number of missionaries (1700), 340; Fairfaxes and, 347, 383, 384; chaplains, 379, 382, 383, 384; *Constitutions of the Mission*, 242
 Bennet, John, 243; indicts the Colleges, 249
 Benson, Thomas, deprived priest, 27
 Berington, Joseph (1746-1827), pamphlet war with Blackburne, 265; and Catholic concessions, 380-1
 Berkely, Sir Francis, 333
 Beseley family, 187, 206, 209, 262, 279
 Beseley, Bridget, 88, 89
 Beseley, Edward, 54, 80, 88-9, 103, 159
 Beseley, John, 239
 Beseley, Reynold, 54, 80
 Besson, Anthony, J.P., 203
 Best family, 269-70, 275
 Best, Mary and Perpetua, nuns, 256
 Best, Richard, 179
 Betson, Thomas, 46
 Beverley, Hilary, 281
 Bickley, Ralph, 168
 Bierley family, 265
 Bierley, Anthony, 83, 311
 Biggen House, 359
 Billingham on Tees, 149, 191
 Bilsdale, 81, 344, 358
 Binks family, 354, 400
 Binks, William, freeholder, 403
 Birdforth, 63; and the Rising, 81; incidence of recusancy, 94, 69, 104, 272, 414-17; Catholic gentry, 184-7, 272-5, 357, 396; newcomers, 275-7; foray against superstitions, 275-6
 Birkbeck family, 353
 Birkby, 36, 60, 83, 95; Catholic congregations, 394; incidence of recusancy, 418
 Birkhead, George (d. 1614), Archpriest, 243, 247, 249
 Bishop, William (1554-1624), Bishop of Chalcedon, 168, 233, 235, 245
 Bishop Auckland, 27, 43
 Bishops' Wars, 302
 Black Humbledon, 318
 Blackburne, Francis (1705-87), Archdeacon of Cleveland, 378-9, 400; *The Confessional*, etc., 364-5
 Blackburne, Lancelot, missionary, 32, 55
 Blackwell, George (?1545-1613), Archpriest, 165, 166, 168
 Blakiston, Sir William, 221; 318
 Blanchard, Roger, pursuivant, 226-7
 Blanchard, William, Commission messenger, 275-6
 Bolron, Robert (*fl.* 1674-80), informer, 329; and Popish Plot, 331, 332
 Bolton, Anselm, Fairfax chaplain, 376-7, 385, 386
 Bolton, Jerome, schoolmaster, 144
 Bolton, John, deprived curate, 45
 Bolton by Bowland, 92, 312
 Bolton Castle, 68; surrender of, 302
 Bolton on Swale, 21, 81, 174, 176, 349; incidence of recusancy, 210, 434
 Book of Common Prayer, use in private chapels, 138-9; recusant bonds and, 192
 Boroughbridge, 44, 85; Tankards and, 78, 128, 246, 311
 Borrowby, 96
 Bossall, 26; incidence of recusancy, 187, 279, 411
 Bouchier, Sir Barrington, J.P., 333
 Bouchier, Ralph, 76
 Bourgeois, Nicholas, surgeon, 401
 Bourn, Mr, surgeon, 402
 Bovell, Henry, 31, 40
 Bowes, sold to City of London, 258; incidence of recusancy, 436-7
 Bowes family, 170, 186, 204, 259, 267, 269, 274, 276, 277
 Bowes, Christopher, his will, 52, 80
 Bowes, Sir George (1527-80), 65, 68, 73, 76, 96; and the Rising, 82

- Bowes, Marmaduke, 186, 194
 Bowes, Talbot, 126
 Bowes, Thomas, 274
 Bowlby, 180, 182, 270, 290
 Boyce, William, 31, 45
 Boynton, E. Riding, 228
 Boynton family, 273, 261, 280
 Boynton, Sir Francis, J.P., 203
 Brackenbury, John, 95
 Brackenbrough, 117, 202, 244
 Bradshaw, Constable, J.P., 336
 Brafferton, 103; Catholic families, 187, 280, 281, 304; sale of, 310, 311; incidence of recusancy, 412
 Braithwaite family, 339, 355, 370
 Braithwaite, Richard, informer, 125, 212, 216
 Braithwaite, Richard (of Catterick), 266
 Braithwaite, Thomas, 338
 Bramhall, John (1594-1633), Archbishop of Armagh, 221, 250
 Brampton, 341, 345, 371, 398, 404 n. 1; Tankards and, 78, 128, 177, 186, 218, 246-7, 326, 335, 348, 349; sale of, 311; house chapel, 388
 Brand, Lancelot, 274
 Brand, Lawrence, 185
 Brandsby, 194, 220, 229, 318, 331, 345; Cholmleys and, 72, 182, 187, 194, 220, 229, 247, 277, 281, 310, 335, 357, 372, 396, incidence of recusancy, 169; Catholic congregations, 250, 382; churchyard plays, 257
 Brandsby Hall, 290; chapel, 389
 Brass family, 102
 Brettanby, 83, 174
 Bridgettine Order, 150, 187, 253, 256, 393
 Brigham family, 401
 Brigham, Mr, of Wyton, 395
 Brighouse, James, 91
 Brignall, 81, 203; incidence of recusancy, 437
 Brockholes, Miss C., 395
 Brompton, 332; incidence of recusancy, 437
 Brotton, 63, 80, 81, 102, 356; incidence of recusancy, 169, 181, 423; Catholic congregations, 257, 394
 Brough, 97, 100; Lawsons and, 129, 176, 195, 255, 260, 263, 308, 312, 319, 335, 351, 354, 370, 372, 379; Jesuit residence, 345; mission district, 387
 Brough Hall, chapel, 389
 Brough family, 175
 Brough, Roger, 79
 Broughton, 189, 269, 330, 350, 356
 Broughton Hall, 395
 Brudenell, Lady Ann, 252
 Brussels, convents, 253, 254, 255, 257, 352, 393
 Buckingham, George Villiers, Duke of (1592-1628), 201, 218, 220, 222, 232, 273, 320
 Buckingham, George Villiers, 2nd Duke of (1628-87), 322, 358
 Bullock family, of S. Holme, 188, 283, 309, 396; of Muscoats, 190, 309, 348, 358, 359, 396
 Bulmer, 25, 63, 72, 99, 263, All Souls' bell-ringing, 23; and the Rising, 81; incidence of recusancy, 99, 103-4, 277, 411-14; Catholic gentry in the Wapentake, 187-8, 277-8, 357-8; Catholic congregations, 394
 Bulmer family, 116, 259, 266, 269, sell Marrick, 353, 354
 Bulmer, Anchotell, 326
 Bulmer, Sir Bertram, 269; accusations against, 245-6
 Bulmer, Henry and wife, 190
 Bulmer, John and wife, 99
 Bulmer, Mrs, 60
 Burchall, Dr James, 401-2
 Burdett, John, Quaker, 344
 Burdon, Christopher, 149
 Burgh family, 101
 Burgh, Dame Christine, prioress of Nunkeeling, 40
 Burgh, Roger, 97
 Burghley, Thomas Cecil, 2nd Baron (1542-1623), and Catholic repression, 112, 121, 131, 134, 145, 152, 168, 175, 182, 200; as President of the North, 115, 116, 120-1, 145
 Burghley, William Cecil, Baron (1520-98), Master of Court of Wards, 224
 Burial, clandestine, 148, 213, 214, 227
 Burke, Edmund (1729-98), 380
 Burneston, 27, 47, 163, 178; and the Rising, 82; incidence of recusancy, 432
 Burnett family, 261
 Burton, Robert, 102
 Burton Constable, 89, 116, 121, 141, 294, 308, 386, 398
 Bury, William, deprived for marriage, 25
 Busby, 203
 Busby, Ann and Teresa, nuns, 352
 Busby, Mary, nun, 393
 Busby, Richard, S.J., 237
 Bussy, John, gent., 105
 Butler family, 189, 283
 Bulter, James, gent., 104
 Buttercrambe, 23, 118, 196, 271, 285
 Buttersett in Wensleydale, 311
 Byrmand, John, curate, 51
 Byrmand, Sir Francis Trappes, 223
 Calvert, Christopher, 177
 Calvert, George, (later Lord Baltimore *see under*), 177, 261

- Calvert, Grace, 176, 265
 Calvert, Leonard, 100, 176-7, 265
 Calvert, Philip, 261
 Calvis, Thornton-le-Street, 262
 Cambrai, Benedictine convent, 257, 352, 393
 Cambridge University, Caius College, 27, 56, 77, 88, 135, 294; Christ's, 55-6, Jesus College, 27; Catholic and Protestant proselytising groups, 77; and religious tests, 135; St John's College, 154, 294; Sidney Sussex College, 262, 294
 Campion, Edmund (1540-81), 55, 56; at Douai, 56; mission to England, 58, 136-8, 158; in Yorkshire, 58-61, 105; Rokeby and, 101; treatment of his shelterers, 137
 Carethorpe, E. Riding, 271, 347
 Carlisle, Charles Howard, 1st Earl of (1629-85), 319, 322; apostate, 307; and his Catholic relations, 319-20
 Carlisle, Henry Howard, 4th Earl of (1694-1758), 66, 86, 377; political influence, 371
 Carlton, 365; Stapletons and, 141, 176, 251; incidence of recusancy, 259, 342, 420; Cattericks and, 309, 315-6, 353; Catholic congregations, 394
 Carlton, Robert, rebel, 83
 Carlton Husthwaite, 48
 Carlton Miniott, 203, 401
 Carmelite Convent (Hoogstraet), 351, 393
 Carr, John (1723-1807) architect, 405 n. 17
 Carr, Robert, 404 n. 17
 Carr, William, architect, 401
 Carrington, Lord, 334
 Carter, Thomas, secular priest, 248
 Carter, Dr William, Dean of Northumberland, non-conformist 'old priest', 40, 41, 51, 52; at Douai, 54, 55
 Carteret, Sir Charles (d. 1719), 360, 367
 Carteret, Edward, S.J., 367
 Carteret, Francis, Benedictine, 367
 Carteret, Jean-Frédéric-Cyr, 367
 Carteret, Lady (d. 1740), *née* Fairfax, 339, 360, 367
 Carteret, Philip, S.J., 367
 Carus, Bartholomew, deprived priest, 31-2, 42, 171
 Case, John (d. 1600), 135
 Castle Howard, 66, 86, 371, 377
 Cathericke, George, priest, 246, 349
 Catholic Committee, and Catholic concessions, 380-2
 Catholic Relief Acts, 364, 368, 370, 376, 380, 382
 Catterick, 46, 79, 159, 319, 338, 399; incidence of recusancy, 141, 147, 176, 263, 431; Catholic congregations, 257; Braithwaites and, 339, 355, 370; Catholic numbers, 393
 Catterick family, 69, 101, 195, 241, 247, 266; landowners, 218, 259; and Douai, 246; of Carlton, 309, 315-16; in decline, 353
 Catterick Bridge, 392
 Catterick, Anthony, 78, 93, 259
 Catterick, Edmund, priest, 234, 244
 Catterick, Francis, gent., his will, 51
 Catterick, George, secular priest, 237, 242, 244
 Cavalier Parliament, and Catholic repression, 323, 325, 339
 Cawton, 190, 269, 347
 Cayton, 221; incidence of recusancy, 417
 Chaderton, William (?1540-1608), Bishop of Chester, 16, 98, 99, 133
 Chace, Margaret, her will, 80
 Challoner, Thomas, gent., 270
 Chaloner family, 179
 Chamber, Allan, Clerk of the Peace, 322
 Champney, Anthony (?1569-?1643), priest, 191
 Chancery Court (York), and recusants, 15; and repression, 147; and clandestine marriages, 149, 150, 215, 227, last session (1640), 233
 Chapels, private, 1581 Act and, 138-9; their situations 388-91
 Chaplains, domestic, enquiry into, 28; 1581 Act and, 138-9; in N. Riding, 1642-1702, 344-5; in N. Riding in eighteenth century, 1382; and patronage, 383-4; as estate agents, 384-5
 Chapman, John, rebel, 83
 Charles I (1600-49), and repression of Catholics, 233
 Charles II (1630-85), and repression of Catholics, 323, 327, 340
 Charles Edward (1720-88), Young Pretender, 367, 368, 369
 Charlton, Thomas, 394
 Chaytor family, 354, 359
 Chaytor, Mary, 255
 Chaytor, Sir William, J.P., 290, 338
 Chester, diocese of, 15-16; High Commission Court and recusancy, 16, 99, 105, 133; visitations of, 28, 31
 Cholmley family, 118, 229; landowners, 12, 71, 72, 159, 176, 184, 187; and Westmorlands, 69; and the Rising, 84; Hoby and, 120; and Whitby, 144, 162, 168, 181, 185, 190, 270, 277; of Brandsby, 187, 277-8, 281, 304, 308, 310, 335, 357, 379, 396, 401; their immorality, 194; and the Bench, 205; financial difficulties, 270-2; recusancy compositions, 277-8; Catholic

Cholmley family *cont.*—
 teachers, 291; estate sequestration, 310–11
 Cholmley, Barbara, 183
 Cholmley, Benet, 69, 83
 Cholmley, Francis (d. 1586), 118; (2) agent to Fairfax, 372, 389, 401
 Cholmley, Sir Henry, 182, 183
 Cholmley, Sir Hugh, 301; and Whitby manor house, 161–2; *Memoirs*, 182, 183; dismissed from the Bench, 230
 Cholmley, Margaret, 182, 183, 194
 Cholmley, Marmaduke, 220, 310, 318
 Cholmley, Mr., 379
 Cholmley, Mrs (of Whitby), 160
 Cholmley, Sir Richard (d. 1583), 23, 69, 72, 96, 105, 116, 182
 Cholmley, Lady, 105, 162, 182
 Cholmley, Sir Richard, J.P., 121, 182–3, 204, 277; Hoby and, 206–7, 290
 Cholmley, Robert, 69
 Cholmley, Sir Roger (d. 1538), 72
 Cholmley, Roger, 105, 182; question of his legitimacy, 194
 Cholmley, Thomas, J.P., 335
 Cholmley, Ursula, 183
 Cholmley, William, 308
 Churches, removal of Catholic fittings, 20–3; attendance at, 96–7
 Churchwardens, and recusants, 18–19; responsibilities, 19; removal of Catholic fittings, 20–3; and recusancy fines, 122, 124, 139, 213
 City of London, N. Riding estates, 258, 262
 Civil War, and the Riding, 301–2, effect on Catholic repression, 302–6; N. Riding Catholics and, 306–10; sequestrations resulting from, 310–12, 313–15; and the missionaries, 339, 340
 Clapton family, 266
 Clarke, Thomas, apostate priest, 141, 143, 160, 181; and Grosmont, 160–1; and Upsall Castle, 161
 Clarkson, William, seminary priest, 151
 Clavering, Lady and Miss, 395
 Cleasby, 21, 60; incidence of recusancy, 434–5
 Cleasby family, 261, 354
 Cleasby, Asculph, 59, 60, 65, 83, 86–7, 95
 Cleasby, Humphrey, rebel, 83
 Cleasby, John, gent., 77
 Cleasby, Ralph, gent., 80
 Cleborne family, 171, 176, 256, 263
 Cleborne, Richard (and wife), pursuivant, 100, 101, 141, 151; and son, 141, 176
 Clerks of the Peace, 322, 324; and land registration, 366, 371
 Cleveland, 21, 23, 162; clerical wills, 52; landowners, 63, 129; and the Rising,

69, 81; recusancy in, 95, 101, 147, 193, 204; its Catholics, 179–80, 191, 355, 393–4, 396, Sheffield and, 199; 'jigs', 289; Civil War and, 301–2; Postgate and, 348, hostility to Catholics, 375, 377
 Cliffe, 242, 342, 345; Withams and, 174, 241, 260, 313, 321, 335, 351, 382, 398, chapel, 389; Catholic numbers, 393
 Clinch, John, Appellant, 168
 Clints, 381, 389
 Clitheroe, Bl. Margaret (d. 1568), 156, 253; *Life of*, 191–2
 Cloubeck, 174, 261
 Clough, John, J.P., 203
 Clove Lodge, 242, 259
 Coate family, 357, 392; freeholders, 402
 Cocken in Bransdale, 47
 Cockrell family, 269, 270, 356
 Cockrell, Percival, 195
 Codner, Fr. David, Benedictine, 250
 Colburne, 310
 Cold Ingleby, 83
 Cold Kirkby, 81, 276; incidence of recusancy, 415
 Coldham, 302
 College of St Michael (Jesuit), 236
 Collingwood family, 356, 395
 Collingwood, Francis (d. 1679), priest, 332
 Collingwood, Miss, 395
 Collingwood, Roger Anselm (d. 1679), Benedictine, 342
 Collingwood, Fr. Thomas, 346
 Comber, Dr, 358
 Committee for Compounding, 303
 Committee for Forfeited Lands, and Catholic estates, 366
 Concett, Edward, actor and tailor, 290
 Constable family, 84, 162, 205, 238; of Halsham, 69; of Dromondby, 179–80; of Flamborough, 205; of Carethorpe, 271
 Constable, Charles, 395
 Constable, Cuthbert, 386, 394
 Constable, George, 80
 Constable, Henry, 294
 Constable, Sir Henry, M.P., 121, 141, 161
 Constable, John, 76, 126, 274, 311
 Constable, Joseph, 185; Council of the North and, 141–3, 161, 274
 Constable, Captain Joseph, 308
 Constable, Lady, 141, 142, 161, 255–6
 Constable, Sir Marmaduke, 395
 Constable, Sir Philip, Councillor of the North, 202; and recusants, 323–4, 325; quittance roll, 326; and Oath of Allegiance, 329, 330; in exile, 330; and Scarborough, 356, 394
 Constable, Sir Ralph and Lady, 277

- Constable, Sir William (d. 1655), regicide, 207, 302
- Constable, William, 398
- Constable, William Maxwell, 395
- Constable Burton, 117, 175, 246, 262, 305, 312-13, 320, 354, 380
- Constables, and recusant presentments, 214, 216, 323-4, 325
- Convents, English, expansion overseas, 253; source of their vocations, 253-7; schools, 351, 352; overseas communities, 351-2; guest houses, 352
- Conyers family, 182, 183; recusants, 101, 174, 176, 178, 179, 180; of Sockburne, 84, 225, 266; and Danby Wiske, 261; of Hutton Bonville, 266-7, 276, 355
- Conyers, Augustine, Benedictine, 241
- Conyers, Mrs Catherine, recusant wife, 103, 171
- Conyers, Christopher, 43, 92, 126, 212
- Conyers, Edward, English agent, 155
- Conyers, Mrs Eleanor, 271
- Conyers, George, Esq., 80
- Conyers, George, gent., 80
- Conyers, Geoffrey, 81
- Conyers, John, Lord, 60, 65, 72, 103; landowner, 62, 63, 81, 87; disappearance of the peerage, 64, 86, 116
- Conyers, Lancelot and wife, 105
- Conyers, Sir Robert and Lady, 270
- Conyers, Samuel, missionary, 57, 138
- Conyers, Thomas, 171, 174
- Conyers, William, wardship of his daughters, 225
- Cooke, Elizabeth, 119
- Copley, Mr, 'old priest', 41
- Cordiner, Christopher, 'player of interludes', 193, 289
- Cornbrough, 396
- Cornwallis family, 184
- Cornwallis, John (*alias* Pracid), 332
- Cornwallis, Sir Thomas (1519-1604), 68
- Cottrell, William, peruke-maker, 402
- Coulson family, 272, 356
- Coulton, 189
- Council of the North, 11, 12; and recusants, 13, 14, 16; and Richard Cholmley, 72; Huntingdon and, 113; choice of President, 115; choice of Councilors, 115-17, 201; and Joseph Constable, 141-3; effect of their 'prerogative action', 145, 146-7; and Grosmont, 161; and the 'jigs', 193; Sheffield and, 199-200, 201, 202, 207; receives a new Commission (1619), 221; Ingram and, 230; last days, 233-4, 322
- Covell family, 265, 305, 354
- Coverdale, 343, 346
- Coverham, 82, 175; incidence of recusancy, 428
- Cowesby, 26, 81; incidence of recusancy, 414
- Cowick, 117
- Cowlings, the, 59
- Cowton, 203, 246, 354; East and Long, 261; Grange, 260
- Coxhow, Co. Durham, 94
- Coxwold, 21, 76, 229, 308, 322, 357; incidence of recusancy, 186, 202, 272, 415; Catholic congregations, 394; Catholic families, 402
- Cragill, John, 137
- Crambe, 103, 281; Catholic fittings, 21; incidence of recusancy, 412
- Crathorn, Thomas, 308
- Crathorne, 80, 83, 94, 95, 179, 336, 384; incidence of recusancy, 170, 268, 420; Catholic congregations, 257, 394; chapel, 345, 390-1; Catholic families, 402
- Crathorne family, 95, 99, 179, 180, 189, 245, 268, 283, 330, 356, 358, 396, 401; chaplains, 384; nuns, 351
- Crathorne, Barbara, Everilda and Mary, nuns, 351
- Crathorne, Elizabeth, 80
- Crathorne, Francis, Benedictine, 242
- Crathorne, George (1), 83, 85; (2), 394
- Crathorne, Mr, master mariner, 402
- Crathorne, Peter, rebel, 83, 85
- Crathorne, Ralph, (1) 268; (2), 384
- Crathorne, Thomas, J.P., recusancy convictions, 268, 326, 335
- Craven, 31, 42, 43
- Craven, Alderman, 335
- Crawford, Cuthbert, missionary, 166, 168
- Crawley, Mr Justice, 231
- Crayke, 62, 81, 83, 103, 203; original altar stones, 22; incidence of recusancy, 412
- Croft, 21, 46, 47, 78, 338, 354; incidence of recusancy, 435
- Croft family, 255, 263, 355, 399
- Crofton, 229
- Cromwell, Mary, 307
- Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658), and sequestration policy, 315, 316; Catholics and, 321
- Cromwell, Thomas, Earl of Essex (?1485-1540), 61
- Crosland family, 189, 191, 283, 284
- Crosland, Henry, J.P., 335, 338, 348
- Crosland, Lady, wife of Sir Jordan, 343; widow, 352
- Crosland, John (1) (d. 1598), 189; (2), J.P., 189, 284, 335

- Crosland, Sir Jordan, J.P., 309, 320;
Governor of Scarborough Castle, 319,
356; and Fox, 343
- Crook, Jerome, apothecary, 101
- Crosby, Helen, recusant wife, 172
- Crosby, Richard, (1) 172, (2) Crown
auditor, 80
- Crouch, Gilbert, buys Catholic estates,
310, 311-12
- Crown, the, landholder in the Riding,
61-2, 81, 170, 175, 178, 184; and the
peerage, 66; gentry and, 70; proceeds
from recusancy fines, 123, 129; and
estate seizure, 217, 220; policy
towards recusancy, 218-20, 222; sale
of land in Gilling West, 258; estates in
Hang West, 261-2
- Croxdale, Co. Durham, 24, 36, 302
- Cumberford, Henry, Marian priest, 30, 113,
136
- Cumberland, Henry Clifford, 1st Earl of
(1493-1542), 72
- Cumberland, Henry Clifford, Earl of (d.
1570), 41
- Cundall, 51; with Leckby, incidence of
recusancy, 433
- Curwen family, 280
- Curwen (papist), 159
- Curwen, Mr, 401
- Cuthbert, Robert, vagrant recusant, 32
- Dacre family, 64, 67, 69, 116, 182
- Dacre, Edward, rebel, 83
- Dacre, Leonard (d. 1573), 27, 63, 81; his
religion, 67, 78; and the Rising, 67, 82,
86; execution, 84
- Dacre, Thomas Dacre, Lord, 62, 63, 65
- Dakins, Sir Arthur, J.P., 203
- Dakyns, Dr, 28
- Dalby, 184, 309, 357; incidence of recu-
sancy, 288, 412
- Dalby in Bulmer, 64, 187, 280
- Dalby, George Turner, schoolmaster, 377
- Dale family, 402
- Dalton, 93, 172, 341, 342; Meynells and,
259, 260, 308, 313, 335, 345, 346,
353, 399, chapel, 389
- Dalton, Robert, 35, 67, 108 n. 29
- Dalton, Roger, 76
- Dalton, Sir William, attorney, 209, 322
- Danby in Cleveland, 21, 47, 63, 81, 90,
159; incidence of recusancy, 423
- Danby Hall, chapel, 389
- Danby on Ure, 331, 345
- Danby Wiske, 47, 60, 92, 248, 261, 313;
incidence of recusancy, 169-70, 174,
435; acquired by Calvert, 261
- Danby family, 116, 179, 246; acquisitions,
72-3; Catholic gentry, 101, 128,
144, 176, 264; of Masham, 121, 127;
of Leake, 267, 311
- Danby, Anthony, 331
- Danby, Sir Christopher (d. 1518), acqui-
sitions, 72
- Danby, Sir Christopher, J.P., (d. 1571),
73, 78, 79
- Danby, Christopher, gs. of Sir Thomas,
Court of Wards and, 128-9
- Danby, Mrs, mother of above, 128-9
- Danby, Christopher, rebel, 83, 84
- Danby, Christopher (d. 1624), s. of Eliza-
beth, 223, 224, 225, 264
- Danby, Mrs Elizabeth (d. 1629), m. of
above, 223, 224, 225, 264
- Danby, James, and Kirkby Knowle, 311
- Danby, John, (1) Major, 309, 311, 315;
(2) secular priest, 375
- Danby, Katherine (later Armitage), 264
- Danby, Richard, s. of Elizabeth, 223
- Danby, Richard, 127, 128, 191; clandestine
marriage, 149
- Danby, Thomas, 308
- Danby, Sir Thomas Osborne, 1st Earl of
(1631-1712), 322
- Danby, Sir Thomas (d. 1590), 90, 117, 127,
196
- Danby, Sir Thomas, gs. of Elizabeth, 225,
228, 264
- Darcy family, 60, 116, 176, 190, 273;
become Protestant, 263
- Darcy, Sir Conyers, 121-2, 204, 210, 229
- Darcy, Lord, 66, 74
- Darcy, Thomas (and wife), 100, 176;
personal Catholicism, 192
- Darley family, 271, 285, 294
- Darley, Richard, 118
- Darlington, 59
- Davell, Thomas, 76
- Dawney family, 81, 117, 178, 205
- Dawney, Sir John, 118
- Dawney, Sir Thomas, sheriff, 210
- Dawney, William, 120
- Dawson, Emmanuel, schoolmaster, 293
- Deane, William, 138
- Deighton, 130
- 'Demi-Jesuits', 236
- Dent family, 343, 384, 353, 396
- Dent, Christopher, fellmonger, 402
- Denton, 283, 305, 316
- Derby, Edward Stanley, 3rd Earl of (1508-
72), 64, 65, 82
- Derby, Henry Stanley, 4th Earl of (1531-
93), and Council of the North, 116,
133
- Devonshire, William Cavendish, 1st Duke
of (1640-1707), 336
- Dicconson, Vicar Apostolic, 384
- Dicconson, William, 360
- Dickson, John, domestic chaplain, 27

- Dieulouard, English monastery, 240, 241, 350, 396
- Digby, Rowland, 206
- Digby, Simon (1) of Bedale, 83; (2) of Aiskew, 84
- Dillon, Mrs, 395
- Dinmore family, farmers, 402
- Dishforth, 23, 63, 275
- Dodsworth, Ralph and Richard, rebels, 83
- Dodsworth, gent., Simon, 97
- Dolben, Mr Justice, 365
- Dolebank (Ripon), Mary Ward and, 306, 332, 351
- Dolman, Sir Robert, 264, 294
- Dominicans, 243, 348; chaplains, 382
- Donnington family, 280, 357
- Douai, English College, 29, 53; N. Riding contingent, 41, 54, 55-8, 89, 150, 152, 153, 241, 348; English youths and, 59, 60, 144, 239, 247, 272, 294; Spanish Congregation, 240; Benedictine school, 241, 385; *Diaries* of convicts, 246
- Douglas family, 393, 401
- Douglas, Mr, apothecary, 402
- Douglas, Thomas, attorney, 401
- Downham, William (1505-77), Bishop of Chester, 15-16
- Downholme, 399, 400; incidence of recusancy, 263, 428; Scropes, 176
- Dromondby, 76, 126, 180
- Dunbar, Henry Constable, 1st Viscount (d. 1645), 308
- Dunbar, Mary Viscountess Dowager, 348
- Dunsley, 255, 256, 279; Fairfaxes and, 74, 102, 182, 183, 212, 270, 279
- Dutton family, 182, 184, 271-2
- Dutton, Katherine, 182, 184, 194
- Dutton, Richard (1), 149; (2), 184
- Ealand, Robert, 104
- Earls' Rising (1569), 12-13, 22, 40; clergy and, 27, 28, 29, 44, 47; Morton and, 37; and conservatism, 47, 52, 65, 67; its aims, 66-7; peers and, 67-8; gentry and, 68-9, 79-82; and non-conformism, 80-1; chief centres, 81-2; tenant and servant supporters, 82; treatment of the rebels, 84-7; purchase of pardons, 85; effect of its failure on Catholicism, 87
- Earneley, Michael, 284
- Earswick, Fosters and, 187, 236-7, 238, 256, 269, 279, 292
- Easbrow, 239
- Easby, 171, 172; Catholic congregations, 393; incidence of recusancy, 437
- Easington, 52, 81; incidence of recusancy, 423
- Easingwold, 52, 81, 273, 335, 371, 399, 401, 403; churchwardens' accounts, 20; Rectory house chapel, 392; Catholic congregations, 394; incidence of recusancy, 412
- East Cowton, incidence of recusancy, 435
- East Harlsey, 63, 81, 241, 357; new Catholic families, 275; and Mount Grace, 275; incidence of recusancy, 415
- East Langbaugh, 101-2, 179; incidence of recusancy, 420-3
- East Ness, manor, 188-9; chapel, 389; chaplains, 395
- East Newton, 104, 189
- East Witton, 263, 354, 393, 402; incidence of recusancy, 430
- Ebberston, incidence of recusancy, 417
- Ecclesiastical Courts, and repression of Catholics 145, 146, 209, 377-8; and marriage cases, 150; Catholic connections of its officials, 209; after 1642, 339, 377-8
- Education, Catholic, 291-2; penalties for sending children abroad, 139, 144-5, 213, 219; private schools in England, 295-6
- Egton, 38, 51, 81, 154, 292, 356, 359, 378, 382; Cholmleys and, 72, 159; incidence of recusancy, 102, 160, 180, 268-9, 423-4; Catholic congregations, 169, 257, 352; 'players of interludes', 181, 193, 289-90, 348; Catholic lower classes, 192-3; secular priests, 239, 240, 247, 332, 347, 382; concentration of Catholics, 379-80, 394; Mass-houses, 391; Catholic families, 396
- Egton Bridge, 181, 293, 343
- Egton-Ugthorpe, mission district, 385
- Elizabeth I (1533-1603), Settlement Acts, 11, 51; injunctions of 1559, 26; and great peers, 66; her deposition by the Pope (*Regnans in Excelsis*), 88; Catholic allegiance to, 164, 167
- Ellerbeck, 267, 276
- Ellerburn, 272; incidence of recusancy, 417
- Ellerker, Francis, 48
- Ellerton, 263, 305, 354
- Elrington family, 272
- Elwes, Cary, and Egton, 379-80
- Enlightenment, the, and Dissent, 365
- Eppleby, Forcett, 295
- Errington, George, guide to priests, 159
- Errington, John, 270
- Eskdaleside, 183, 270
- Essex, Robert Devereux, Earl of (1566-1601), 118, 142, 167; his 'revolt', 121, 182, 200; Catholics and, 205, 206

- Estates (Catholic), seizure, 127-8, 217, 220; sequestration after Civil War, 310-12, 313-15; Statutes concerning, 366, 373; taxation and, 337-8, 367, 371, 372-3
- Etherington family, 184
- Etherington, Sir Richard, J.P., 203
- Eure family, 93, 205, 246, 358; and Civil War, 308; and Hoby, 193
- Eure, George, J.P., 305
- Eure, Ralph, 3rd Lord, 116-17, 203, 257; and Appellant crisis, 248; recusancy, 283; financial difficulties, 283-4
- Eure, Major Thomas, 308
- Eure, William, 120
- Eure, William, Lord, 14, 27, 102, 121, 183, 203; land holdings, 64, 81, 83, 180; his religion, 68, 283; and Council of the North, 116; chapel at Malton, 318
- Eure, Sir William, 4th Lord, 217; Hoby and, 120, 121; J.P., 203; sale of estates, 284
- Eure, Sir William, brother of 3rd Lord, 203-4
- Eure, Colonel Sir William, killed at Marston Moor, 308
- Exchequer the, and recusancy fines, 14, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 131, 133, 206, 232, 318-19, 326, 327; and Riding lands, 61, 131; the sheriffs and, 210; and Meynell estate, 315, 326
- Eyre, Henry, 395
- Faceby, Mr, missionary, 341
- Fairfax family, 190, 246, 270, 359-60, and Gilling, 72, 73, 121, 182, 189, 250, 281-3, 305, 306, 309, 328; and Dunsley, 183, 269, 270, 356; mixed religious influences, 239, 282; acquisitions, 281; and Protestantism, 282; and Civil War, 309; and Duke of York, 333; of Ryedale, 357, 396; and Jacobitism, 367-9; and Ampleforth, 373
- Fairfax, Alethea (Howard), Viscountess, 359
- Fairfax, Hon. Anne, 376, 395
- Fairfax, Charles, ensign, 319, 338
- Fairfax, Hon. Charles, Benedictine chaplain of, 379, 383
- Fairfax, Charles Fairfax, 5th Viscount, 333, 358; succeeds to estate, 316; in exile, 330; Catholic friends, 334; Lord Lieutenant of the Riding and J.P., 335-6; suspect, 338-9; chaplaincy, 347; his wife, Abigail, 359
- Fairfax, Charles Fairfax, 6th Viscount (d. 1715), 367-8, 374
- Fairfax, Charles Fairfax, 7th Viscount (d. 1719), 368
- Fairfax, Charles Fairfax, 9th Viscount, 368, 376, 396, 400, 401; career, 369; sales of land, 372; advowson, 373; estate trustee, 374; chaplains, 383-4; and Gilling Castle, 389
- Fairfax, Ferdinando Fairfax, 2nd Baron (1584-1648), 265, 283
- Fairfax, Gabriel (d. 1582), and Mrs Robertes, 281
- Fairfax, George (1), 212; (2), *alias* Robinson, 374
- Fairfax, Hon. Henry (1), 102; (2), Jesuit apostate, 278, 282
- Fairfax, Henry Culpepper, 373-4
- Fairfax, Lady Katherine (d. 1626), 282
- Fairfax, Hon. Mary (Lady Carteret), 333, 360
- Fairfax, Matthew, s. of Mrs Robertes, 281
- Fairfax, Hon. Nicholas (d. 1703), 83, 279, 328; and Civil War, 319; second marriage, 333; annuitant, 360-1
- Fairfax, Sir Nicholas (d. 1571), acquisitions, 73-4, 102; religion, 78
- Fairfax, Thomas, s. of Mrs Robertes, 281
- Fairfax, Thomas, S.J., 367
- Fairfax, Sir Thomas, J.P., 117, 121, 189, 217-18, 221, 282
- Fairfax, Thomas Fairfax, 3rd Baron (1612-71), General, 295, 316, 322
- Fairfax, Thomas Fairfax, 6th Baron (1692-1782), 373-4, 398
- Fairfax, Thomas Fairfax, 1st Viscount (d. 1636), 223, 224, 228, 230, 282; wardship of Radcliffe, 225
- Fairfax, Thomas Fairfax, 2nd Viscount (d. 1641), 228, 296, 307, 347; and his son's religion, 224, 283; Catholic vagrant, 282; recusant composition, 282-3
- Fairfax, William Fairfax, 3rd Viscount, 283
- Fairfax, William Fairfax, 8th Viscount (d. 1736), 368, 372, 374
- Fairfax, William, 401
- Fairfax, Sir William (d. 1597), 74, 104; his 'Book of Arms', 69-70; drive against recusants, 98-9; and Council of the North, 117, 118-19, 202, 282
- Farlington, 278, 402
- Farnley, 72, 73, 127
- Fauconberg family, and the Clerkship of the Peace, 322, 371
- Fauconberg, Thomas Bellasis, 1st Viscount (d. 1653), 228, 229, 313; and the Civil War, 273-4, 308; refuses Oath of Abjuration, 308-9

- Fauconberg, Thomas Bellasis, 2nd. Viscount, 1st Earl (1627-1700), 66, 334, 371, 372; takes Oath of Abjuration, 307, 313; Lord Lieutenant of N. Riding, 319, 322; his dismissal, 335; death, 357
- Fauconberg, Thomas Bellasis, 2nd Earl, 357, 358
- Fauconberg, Thomas Bellasis, 3rd Viscount (d. 1718), 371, 372, 396
- Fauconberg, Thomas Bellasis, 4th Viscount (d. 1774), 371, 401; and Land Tax, 372-3; chaplains, 383; apostate, 396; and his estates, 396-7
- Fauconberg, 5th Viscount (d. 1802), 397
- Faure, Jean Louis, 395
- Fawkes family, 59
- Fawkes, Edward, 209
- Fawkes, Guy (1570-1606), 59, 206
- Fearby family, freeholders, 402
- Feckenham, John (?1518-85), deprived Abbot of Westminster, 39
- Felixkirk, 58, 296
- Felsted School, 283
- Fenwick, Cuthbert, 395
- Fenwick, William, 233
- Fermor family, 396
- Fermor, James, 401
- Ferne, John, secretary to Council of the North, 207, 209-10
- Ferrari, Dr, 395
- Fielden, John, runagate papist, 31
- Fingall, incidence of recusancy, 89-90, 428-9
- Fining system, basis of, 122; administration, 122-5; informers and, 125; weaknesses, 125-9; evidence of, 129-31; and wives of conformists, 131-2, financial difficulties, 132-5; Commission on, 209, 211; Statutes relating to, 212-13; and recusant wives of Protestants, 213; increased ingenuity, 215; Recusancy Commission, and, 219; Long Parliament and, 302-3; after the Civil War, 312; after the Restoration, 326-7; after the Revolution, 337
- Firbank, Robert, runagate papist, 28, 42
- Firby, Metcalfes and, 130, 246, 265, 274, 316, 355
- Fischer, Baron, 394
- Fish, Cornelius, 328, 333, 335
- Fitzherbert, Margaret and Richard, 395
- Fobrey, Mr, (Protestant tutor), 177
- Forcett, 92, 149, 355, 400, 403; incidence of recusancy, 169, 171, 295, 437; Catholic congregations, 257, 393
- Forster family, 400
- Foster family, 187, 238, 256, 279; and Stokesley, 269, 279, 346, 355, 391
- Foster, Agnes, wife of John, 88, 187
- Foster, Henry, 304
- Foster, Isabel, 187
- Foster, John, 54, 187, 292
- Foster, Sir Richard, servant of the Queen, 232, 238, 256-7, 269
- Foster, Seth, seminary priest, 55, 145, 187, 238, 256, 292
- Foster, Thomas, seminary priest, 187, 236-7, 238
- Foster, William, father of Thomas and Seth 187-8,
- Poston, incidence of recusancy, 412
- Foulis, Sir David, J.P., 203, 229, 326, 336
- Fowler, William, 335
- Framlingham, priests' prison, 153
- Franciscans, 243, 342; womens' convent, 257, 351, 393; Osmotherley convent, 276-7, 347, 387; and Ugthorpe, 349
- Frank, Richard, Archdeacon of Yorkshire, 341, 344, 354
- Franke family, 174, 190-1, 260-1, 266, 312, 354
- Franke, Christopher, 174
- Franke, George, 174, 212, 257
- Franke, Margaret, nun, 257
- Franke, Marmaduke, 261
- Franke, Mr, of Kneton, 306
- Franke, Mrs, recusant wife, 171
- Franke, Robert, sheriff's deputy, 211
- Franke, William, rebel, 83
- Frankland family, 354, 399, 400
- Frankland, Anthony and wife, 263
- Frankland, Henry, Clerk of the Peace, 322, 371
- Freare, Ellen, 196
- Freeman, Michael, S.J., 237
- Fryton, 130, 188
- Fulford, 398
- Fulthorpe, Mrs Jane, 52
- Fulthorpe family, 81, 180, 181, 191, 269
- Fulthorpe, Edward, 160
- Fulthorpe, Francis, rebel, 83, 94, 95, 104
- Fulthorpe, John, rebel, 83, 84, 86, 94
- Fyling Hall, 182, 183, 269, 270
- Fylingdales, Whitby, 160, 270; incidence of recusancy, 344, 426
- Gainforth, 91
- Ganthorpe, 23, 63
- Gargett, William, runagate papist, 28, 42
- Gargrave, Francis, steward to Sheffield, 199
- Gargrave, Sir Richard, sheriff, 210
- Gargrave, Sir Thomas (1495-1579), 12, 53, 68; list of the gentry, 70, 84, 97, 98, 115; and the laity's religion, 75, 76, 78, 79; and recusants, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 200

- Garstang, William and wife, 284
- Garth, John, 89
- Gascoigne family, 259, 270, 278, 353, 396
- Gascoigne, Mrs Jane, recusant wife, 42, 92-3, 100-1, 171, 173
- Gascoigne, Richard (1), rebel, 83, 92; (2), priest, 332, 343
- Gascoigne, Sir Thomas (?1593-1686), 331; his trial, 329; and Mary Ward's nuns, 332
- Gascoigne, Sir Thomas, apostate, 374, 398
- Gascoigne, Sir William and Lady, 173, 231
- Gate Helmsley, 54, 55
- Gatenby, 61, 163, 177, 266
- Gatenby family, 163, 177, 265
- Gatenby, Anthony, 100
- Gatenby, Mrs, 234, 247
- Gaterd, Christabel, 276
- Gaterley, 80
- Gates family, 183, 184
- Gates, Sir Henry, 76, 81, 184
- Gatherley Race, 239, 292
- Gayles, 166; Andersons and, 353, 399, 400
- Gee, Sir William, Revenue Commissioner, 212
- Gehegan, Mr, 395
- Gentry, N. Riding, rebel lords and, 68-9; their numbers, 69-70; condition and ambitions, 70-1; members of, 71-5; religion, 75-9; and the Rising, 82-5; fate of their estates, 86; Catholic numbers, 88-9, 101, 257-85; use of private chapels, 138-9; reluctance to shelter priests, 143; and clandestine marriage, 149-50; impact of Catholicism on, 169 ff., 190, 205; and the Bench, 205; Benedictine missions to, 242-3; Appellant crisis and, 248; and education, 293 ff.; post-war sequestrations, 316-17; property legislation and, 373-6; fate after 1642, 396-403
- Ghent, Jesuit house, 238, 293; women's community, 256, 351, 352
- Gibson family, 203
- Gibson, Dunstan, Benedictine apostate, 251
- Gilling, ix, 28, 42, 46, 92-3, 318, 342, 403; All Souls' bell-ringing, 23; Fairfaxes and, 72, 78, 102, 121, 182, 189, 202, 217, 221, 223, 282-3, 305, 316, 347, 358, 367-8, 373, 379, 383; secret meeting, 1660, 316; and Jacobitism, 367-8, 369; advowson, 373; chaplains, 393-4, 395, 396; Catholic congregations, 394; incidence of recusancy, 409, 437
- Gilling Castle, 73, 104, 290, 347, 350; and the '45, 369; Catholic requisites, 398; chapels, 399
- Gilling East, 60, 81; incidence of recusancy, 173-4, 260-1, 272, 354, 436-40; Catholic congregations, 393; Catholic families, 396
- Gilling West, 81; incidence of recusancy, 170-1, 258-60 *passim*, 353, 434-6; land ownership changes in, 258-60; Catholic congregations, 393; Catholic families, 396
- Girlington, 171, 258
- Girlington family, 171, 176, 258, 263, 353
- Girlington, John, 176
- Girlington, Ninian, 294
- Girlington, William, his education, 294
- Givendale, 311, 388
- Glaisdale, 63, 402; Catholic population, 394; incidence of recusancy, 424
- Glover, Robert, 195
- Goathland, 184, 273, 290, 380
- Gooderick, Thomas, priest, 351
- Goodrick, Robert, vagrant Catholic, 284
- Gordon, Franciscan priest, 371
- Gotherick, Francis, 296-7
- Gower family, 84, 176, 180, 268, 304
- Gower, Sir Edward and Lady, 76, 89
- Gower, Edward, 103
- Gower, Elizabeth, 102
- Gower, Helen, 102
- Gower, John (1), seminary priest and rebel, 54, 56-7, 83, 84, 85, 89, 100, 106; (2), 290
- Gower, Mrs Mary, recusant wife of Roger, 171, 172
- Gower, Nicholas, rebel, 83
- Gower, Ralph, 40, 56, 103
- Gower, Roger, 100, 172
- Gower, Sir Thomas (1), d. 1577, 76; (2), 281
- Gowlthwait Hall, Catholic players, 289, 320
- Graham, Sir Richard, J.P., 336
- Grange family, 241, 275, 357, 359
- Grange, George Gregory, Benedictine, 241
- Grange, Jane, teacher, 295
- Grange, Marmaduke, 295
- Grange, William Gregory, Southern Provincial, O.S.B., 241
- Grant family, 265
- Grant, William, rebel, 83
- Gravelines, Poor Clares community, 256, 351
- Grayson, William, draper, 402
- Great Ayton, 64, 84, 180; incidence of recusancy, 420
- Great Edston, 27; incidence of recusancy, 409
- Great Langton, 92; incidence of recusancy, 435
- Great Moresholm, 64

- Great Smeaton, 92; incidence of recusancy, 436
- Green, Anthony, deprived priest, 26
- Green, Nicholas, chaplain, 44
- Greenbury, 392
- Greene family, 179, 191, 244, 267; and Douai, 246; and Lanmoth, 311, 355
- Greene, Anthony, rebel, 83
- Greene, Edmund and Henry, secular missionaries, 244
- Greene, Francis, priest, 348
- Greene, John, 105
- Greenwood, John, curate, 47
- Grene, Francis, example of neutralism, 36
- Gresham, Sir Thomas (?1519-79), 73
- Greyston, John, merchant, 402
- Grimston family, 37, 55, 60, 95, 178, 209
- Grimston, George, 57
- Grimston, Marmaduke, 44, 95
- Grimston, Sir Marmaduke, Councillor of the North, 202; sheriff, 210
- Grimston, Thomas, shelterer of Campion, 59-60, 95, 117, 137
- Grimston Garth, 59, 178
- Grimthorpe, E. Riding, 163, 187
- Grindal, Edmund (?1519-83), Archbishop of Canterbury, and repression of Catholics, 13; visitation of Richmond, 1571, 16, 18; 'old priest', 33; and the laity's religion, 75, 77; and recusants, 93, 113
- Grinton, 21, 48, 79, 331; incidence of recusancy, 169, 175, 176, 429; Catholic congregations, 257, 393; Swales and, 263, 295, 305, 312, 334, 345
- Grosmont, 154, 159, 242
- Grosmont Priory, priests' refuge, 160, 162, 165, 166, 168, 181; raid on, 182; Hodgsons and, 192-3
- Guisborough, 48, 80, 179, 211, 301, 313, 355; Catholic 'objects', 21, 23; Grammar School, 30; incidence of recusancy, 32, 95-6, 102, 169, 180, 268, 270, 424; Pursglove and, 38; and the Rising, 83, 84
- Gunpowder Plot, 201, 288; N.R. Catholics and, 205, 206
- Hackforth, Pudseys and, 174, 176, 259
- Hackness, 119, 181, 270, 322, 351; incidence of recusancy, 426
- Hallikeld, land speculation in, 177; Catholic families, 265-6, 352, 393, 396
- Hambledon, racecourse, 276, 287
- Handale, 351
- Hang East, Catholic numbers, 176-7, 263-5, 354-5; Catholic families, 396; incidence of recusancy, 430-2
- Hang West, Catholic numbers, 175-6, 262-3, 354, 393; land ownership changes, 261-2; incidence of recusancy, 428-30
- Hanson, John, Archdeacon of Richmond, 25
- Hardesty, apostate priest, 162
- Harding family, 181, 269
- Hardwick family, 359, 396; freeholders, 402
- Hardwick, William, priest, 331, 333, 341-2
- Harewell, 254
- Hargill, Mrs, 181
- Harpsfield, John (1516-78), 39
- Harrington family, 206, 272
- Harrington, Henry, 185
- Harrington, Mr, of York, 53
- Harrington, Petronella, 185
- Harrington, William, priest, 58, 59, 105, 137, 150, 185; and martyrdom, 156; and treason, 157-8
- Harrison family, freeholders, 402
- Harrison, secular priest, 247
- Harsnett, Samuel (1561-1631), Archbishop of York, 226
- Hart, John, 80
- Hart, William, priest, 137
- Harton family, 272
- Harton, Elizabeth, 105
- Hauxwell, 175, 209, 322; incidence of recusancy, 90, 153, 429
- Hawksworth family, 37, 60
- Hawksworth, William, 60
- Hawny, 45, 104, 154, 247, 290; Meynells and, 74, 77, 94, 143, 185, 193, 239, 269, 274; incidence of recusancy, 277, 415
- Haxby, 103; incidence of recusancy, 413
- Headlam, Mrs, Protestant, 288
- Healaugh, 64, 67, 153
- Healaugh Park, 177
- Healey, 295
- Heath, Nicholas (?1501-78), Archbishop of York, 11
- Heaton, Richard, informer and agent, 125, 211, 232, 268, 285; Star Chamber and, 211-12, 232
- Hebblethwaite, Robert, Commissioner of Richmond, 16, 79
- Hebblethwaite, Thomas, 203
- Hebburn family, 272
- Heddon family, mercers, 402
- Heighington, Robert, 54, 84, 173
- Heighington, William, priest, s. of above, 173
- Helmsley, 59, 80, 104, 296, 309, 319, 335, 384; concealed Catholic fittings, 21; Catholic gentry, 189, 283, 358; Catholic congregations, 257, 394; Manners and, 284; Mass-houses, 392; Holdforths and, 402, 403; incidence of recusancy, 409-10

- Helmsley Castle, siege of, 302, 309
 Helmsley, Gate, incidence of recusancy, 413
 Hemingborough, 173, 174
 Herbert, John, Protestant, 76
 Hervey, Monoux, 375; his mission school, 385; register of pastoral work, 387
 Hesketh, Thomas, 395
 Heworth, 54, 103, 156, 187; Thwings and, 55, 141, 156, 187, 215, 238-9, 244-5, 278, 309, 313, 357, 399; manor house, 163; incidence of recusancy, 413
 Heworth Hall, and Mary Ward, 296, 347, 351
 Higgin, Rev. Anthony, Dean of Ripon, his school, 294
 Hildreth, Thomas, schoolmaster, 295
 Hildyard family, 205
 Hildyard, William, 118
 Hildyard, William junr., 120
 Hilton, 74, 81, 263; Catholic congregations, 257, 394; incidence of recusancy, 269, 356, 420-1
 Hinderskelf, 63
 Hinderwell, 24, 51, 81, 96; Catholic congregations, 394; incidence of recusancy, 424
 Hipswell, 21, 47, 52
 Hoby, Lady Margaret, 119
 Hoby, Sir Thomas Posthumous, 183, 229; and Council of the North, 119, 181, 221; and Eure family, 120 121, 193; and priests' landings, 162; and Cholmley estate, 184, 206-7, 270; *Custos Rotulorum*, 203, 214; and the 'old gentry' J.P.s, 204-5, 206, 207; and recusant presentments, 214; Wentworth and, 227, 284; and Egton players, 290
 Hodgson family, 160, 161, 240; freeholders, 402
 Hodgson, Cuthbert, gent, 402
 Hodgson, James and wife Catherine, 192-3
 Hodgson, John (1), keeper of Grosmont Priory, 160, 161, 192; (2), peruke maker, 402
 Hodgson, Richard, Benedictine, 240
 Holbeach, Martin, Master of Felsted School, 283
 Holden, Christopher, priest, 47
 Holden, Henry, ex-Jesuit, 245-61, 341
 Holden, Christopher, priest, 47
 Holden, Thomas, deprived priest, 26
 Holdforth family, 403
 Holdforth, James, 403
 Holdforth, Joseph, 402, 403
 Holme family, 187, 279, 292
 Holme, Seth, 76, 88, 103, 279; his Fairfax wards, 281
 Holme, Wilfrid (d. 1538), 76
 Holtby, incidence of recusancy, 413
 Holtby family, 188, 239, 244, 358; sold up, 311
 Holtby, Anthony, 172
 Holtby, Mrs Elizabeth, 194, 212
 Holtby, George, 104, 188, 194, 296
 Holtby, Lancelot (1), 55; (2), Lieut. Col., 308
 Holtby, Marmaduke, J.P., 288, 335
 Holtby, Richard (1553-1640), missionary, 55-6, 58, 172, 188, 237, 296; becomes a Jesuit, 61, 155, 165; his priests' refuge, 159, 160; leader of 'Jesuit' party, 164-88; and Catholic personality, 191; and occasional conformity, 195; Superior of College of St Michael, 236; and Oath of Allegiance, 247
 Holtby, Robert, 283, 294
 Holtby Hole, 145
 Hood Grange, Metcalfes and, 104, 130, 135, 170, 185, 270, 274
 Hornby, 63, 101, 145, 263, 265; Darcys and, 60, 121, 176, 273; incidence of recusancy, 431
 Hornby Castle, 87, 100, 192
 Horner family, 263
 Hotham family, 205
 Hotham, Sir John (d. 1645), 301
 Hovingham, 21, 55, 130, 132, 242, 245, 249, 402; incidence of recusancy, 104, 169, 410; Holtbys and, 155, 237, 244; Catholic gentry, 188, 281, 283, 358; landowners, 188, 211, 212, 359; Catholic congregations, 257, 394; Worsleys and, 284, 358
 Howard family, 199
 Howard, Lieut. Col. Philip, 308
 Howard, Lord Thomas, Lord Lieutenant of W. Riding, 335
 Howard, Sir William, 281
 Howard, Lord William (1563-1640), 250, 282; acquires Dacre estate, 86, 281; supports the regulars, 248
 Howsham, 39, 203
 Huby, 280
 Huddlestone, W. Riding, 348
 Huddlestone, Richard (1583-1655), Benedictine missionary, 242, 249, 252-3, 340-1; 346: *Short and Plain Way to the Faith*, 253
 Hull, 30, 35, 38, 95, 302, 308; Block-houses, 146, 160, 216
 Hungate family, 187, 279, 374
 Hungate, Fr. Augustine, 250
 Hungate, Sir Charles, 374
 Hungate, Lady, 348
 Hungate, Robert, Benedictine, 249, 250; *Mystical Crowne*, 246, 253
 Hungate, Robert, J.P., 203, 204, 250

- Hunsdon, Henry Carey, Baron (?1542-96), 65, 86; and great peers, 66
- Hunt family, freeholders, 402
- Hunter family, 272, 307, 356-7
- Hunter, Mrs, recusant, 184
- Hunter, Mary and Martha, nuns, 352
- Hunter, Robert, treasurer for the Bench, 307
- Huntingdon, Henry Hastings 3rd Earl of (1535-95), 4, 133, 224; President of the North, 13, 14, 78, 112, 113, 115, 116, 146, 157; and repressive machinery, 20; list of 'old priests', 45; and recusants, 59, 97 ff., 112, 113; and Protestantism, 76, 77; as an administrator, 112-13; and religious persecution, 114, 200; his death, 118; use of apostate priests, 144, 151-2; and Jesuits, 146
- Huntington, 54, 76, 88, 187, 357; incidence of recusancy, 103, 279, 280, 413; teacher, 292
- Hunton, 316, 355
- Hussey, Thomas, 171
- Husthwaite, 21; incidence of recusancy, 415
- Husthwaite, John, schoolteacher, 293
- Hutchinson, Christopher, 47
- Hutchinson, George, 46
- Hutchinson, John, yeoman, 286
- Hutchinson, Mrs Mary, 260
- Hutchinson, Thomas, dyer, 402
- Hutton Bonville, 37, 241; Conyers family and, 43, 57, 63, 105, 126, 178, 212, 241, 266, 355; schoolteacher, 292
- Hutton Bushel, 290; incidence of recusancy, 290
- Hutton Conyers, 178; incidence of recusancy, 418
- Hutton Magna, 400; Catholic congregations, 393; incidence of recusancy, 437-8
- Hutton Rudby, 180, 212, 215, 255, 267, 344, 388, 400; Mary Ward and, 268, 276, 296, 347; Catholic congregations, 394
- Hutton, Matthew (1529-1606), Archbishop of York, 203; and repression of Catholics, 112, 114, 200; and Council of the North, 115; as President, 118, 121, 142, 207; use of apostate priests, 144; and Thornborough, 208-9
- Hutton, Thomas John, Benedictine, 240
- Hutton, Peter, secular priest, 239
- Hutton, Sir Timothy, J.P., 203
- Huttons Ambo, incidence of recusancy, 103, 413
- Hyndmarsh, Mrs, 101
- Hyndmers, Reginald, chaplain, 28; his will, 51
- 'Ignatian', unknown prisoner, 248, 249
- 'Ignatians', 166, 236, 237, 239, 243, 341, 345
- Ile, Hugh, 'old priest', ordained by Tunstall, 44
- Informers, professional, 125; apostate priests, 143, 144, 333; and Popish Plot, 332, 333
- Ingleby, Lady Ann, 269
- Ingleby Arncliffe, incidence of recusancy, 421
- Ingleby Greenhow, 64, 81, 203, 229, 270, 279; sold by Eure, 284; incidence of recusancy, 421
- Ingleby family, 191, 205, 206, 246, 255, 257; sell Hutton Rudby, 267
- Ingleby, John, 180, 186, 212, 215, 248, 312
- Ingleby, Sir William, 78, 186
- Ingram family, 273, 282; freeholders, 402
- Ingram, Sir Arthur, 282; land speculations, 230, 261, 267
- Ingram, John, 230
- Inns of Court, combed for recusants, 98; Catholic tutors, 106; and Oath of Supremacy, 134-5, use of by Catholic families, 294-5
- Ireland, Elizabeth Lady, vagrant Catholic, 284
- Ireland, Sir Francis, 229
- Ireland, William, vagrant Catholic, 284
- Irwin, Lord, 368
- Islebeck, 83, 84, 94
- Jackson family, 179, 191, 267, 355
- Jackson, George, 178
- Jackson, Thomas, 315
- Jacobitism, 338, 350, 365-6; N. Riding Catholics and, 367-70, 404 n. 2
- James I (1566-1625), 'jig' after his accession, 193; and religious persecution, 200; and honours, 202; concessions to Catholics, 218-19, 235
- James II (1633-1701), 333-4; and Catholic hopes, 334, 336, 343; in exile, 338, 339, 350, 360
- James Francis Edward Stuart (1688-1766), Old Pretender, 367
- Jenison, Mrs, 'dame', 385
- Jenison, Thomas, S.J., 239, 292
- Jenkins, Fr., S.J., 384
- Jenkyns, Sir Henry, J.P., 203
- Jennings, Sir John, J.P., 333
- Jesuits, N. Riding missions, 58-61, 154-5, 158, 159, 164-8, 236, 342, 382, 384; Royal Commissions against, 113, 146; arguments with secular priests, 164, 166, 235, 247; Appellants and, 166-7; increase in after 1603, 235, 236-7; their 'residences', 230-2, 237-9;

Jesuits—*cont.*

- influence in the Riding, 239; and Oath of Allegiance, 248, 251; apostates, 251, 278, 282, 341; and spiritual help for women, 254; as teachers, 293; numbers of missionaries (1700), 340; and Brough, 345; and Richmond, 346; effect of their suppression, 383
- Jobson, Matthew, J.P., 203
- Johnson, Anthony, vicar of Richmond, 48-9, 172
- Johnson, Richard, missionary, 148-9, 153-4
- Johnson, William, secular priest, 248
- Jones, Leander, Benedictine, 243, 250
- Jowsey, Andrew, priest, 332
- Judges, the, Wentworth and, 224, 231; and repression of Catholics, 14, 323-5
- Justices of the Peace (N. Riding), and recusants, 12, 14, 17, 98, 122-4, 125, 206-7, and Oath of Supremacy, 77-8; in 1603-19, 202 ff.; Catholic members, 203-4; internal legal battle, 204 ff.; and Oath of Allegiance, 212; and penal Statutes against recusants, 212-15, 121-2, 230; revolt against Wentworth, 229-30; reconstituted by Parliamentarians, 302-5; post war proceedings, 317-18; Catholic influence, 320-2; post Restoration proceedings, 324, 325, 328-33; appointment of Catholics (1687), 335-6; Protestant character after Revolution, 338, 370-1
- Kay, Robert, his Catholic school, 176-7
- Kearton family, freeholders, 402
- Keebeck, 328
- Keldholme Priory, 190
- Kellam, Laurence, 159
- Kendal family, 402
- Kendall, Richard, 392
- Kennet, Henry, priest, 377
- Kepwick, 83, 178, 233, 277, 359
- Keynes, George, S.J., 238
- Kidney, William, armed papist, 318
- Kilburne, 81, 104; incidence of recusancy, 130, 170, 185, 270, 277, 416
- Kildale, 63; incidence of recusancy, 421
- Killerby, 63, 100, 141, 159, 178
- Kilton, 270, 356
- King, Anthony, rebel, 85
- King, Richard and wife, 90-1
- Kingthorpe Grange, 271
- Kiplin, Calverts and, 99, 100, 209, 265, 327, 346, 349
- Kirby, Luke, missionary, 55, 157
- Kirk Leavington, 21, 46, 63, 356; incidence of recusancy, 169, 421; Catholic congregations, 257
- Kirkby (Knowle) Castle, resting place for priests, 161, 168; incidence of recusancy, 169, 171, 274, 277, 415-16
- Kirkby Fletham, 21, 47, 83, 94; incidence of recusancy, 178, 431
- Kirkby Hill, 28, 247, 297; incidence of recusancy, 179, 433
- Kirkby in Cleveland, 25, 36, 64; incidence of recusancy, 421
- Kirkby Knowle, 141, 185, 205, 311
- Kirkby Misperton, 48, 184, 218, 228, 246; incidence of recusancy, 417
- Kirkby Moorside, 40, 64, 190; and the Rising, 81, 84; incidence of recusancy, 410
- Kirkby Ravensworth, 28, 93, 353; incidence of recusancy, 164, 167, 295, 296, 297, 438; Catholic congregations, 258, 393; sold to City of London, 258
- Kirkby Sigston, incidence of recusancy, 179, 418
- Kirkby Wiske, 152, 173, 202, 244; incidence of recusancy, 435
- Kirkdale, 190, 348, 358; incidence of recusancy, 283, 410; Catholic congregations, 394
- Kirke family, 360
- Kirkleatham, ix, 64, 96, 102; incidence of recusancy, 424
- Kirklington, 77, 91, 170, 208, 225; incidence of recusancy, 433
- Knaresborough, 44, 184, 296
- Knatchbull, Fr., S.J., 379, 389
- Knayton, 83, 191, 267, 315, 355
- Knighton, Frankes and, 171, 190, 257, 260, 312, 341, 354
- Knott, William, churchwarden, 21
- Knowles, Gilbert, Fr., 386
- Lacey family, 183, 237
- Lademan, Ann, 80
- Laity, and runagate priests, 45; their wills, 51-2, 80; religious conservatism, 61, 75; need for episcopal control, 248-9; need for spiritual direction, 251-2; their outlook, 1604-42, 286-8; in the Riding, 1642-1702, 256-8
- Lambarde, William (1536-1601), 77, 124, 128, 134
- Lambert, Robert, 93
- Lambspring monastery, 374
- Lambton family, of Malton, 189
- Lambton, Joseph, priest-martyr, 189
- Land Tax Commissioners, and Catholic estates, 327-8, 337-8, 355, 359, 367, 371, 372-3
- Langbaugh, 99, 101-2; Catholics in the Wapentake, 179, 267-9, 355-6; landowners, 179; newcomers to, 269-71, 355, 356; incidence of recusancy, 420-5

- Langdale family, 396, 397-8
 Langdale, Alban (*f.* 1584), Archdeacon of Lewes, 25, 39
 Langdale, Lord, 328, 395; Lord Lieutenant of E. Riding, 335; in exile, 341
 Langdale, Sir Marmaduke, sheriff, 231
 Langdale, Thomas of London, 401
 Langdale, William, 394
 Langley, Richard, martyr, 187
 Langton, 46, 305
 Langton on Swale, 47
 Langworth, Anthony, priest, 332, 342
 Lanmoth, Greenes and, 83, 244, 267, 293, 355; sale of, 311
 Lartington, 152, 239, 342, 345, 353; Applebys and, 242, 259, 262; Maires and, 336; chapel, 389
 Lascelles family, 174, 176, 244, 270; and the Rising, 82; fate of their estates, 86, 87, 191, 218, 261, 266, 354; and Douai, 246
 Lascelles, Christopher, 83, 84, 86; charges against, 79-80
 Lascelles, Mrs Edward, nun, 351
 Lascelles, Francis, 79, 90
 Lascelles, George, 177
 Lascelles, John (1) and (2), priests, 244, 341
 Lascelles, Ralph, priest, 244
 Lascelles, Richard, priest, 336; *Voyage of Italy*, 237, 244; *Little Way How to Heare Mass*, 252
 Lastingham, incidence of recusancy, 410
 Lascelles, Rose, 405 n. 17
 Lascelles, Thomas, priest, 244
 Lascelles, Sir Thomas Councillor of the North and sheriff, 117, 121, 174, 202, 204, 210
 Latimer family, 116
 Latimer, John Neville, Lord, 73; land-owner, 63, 64, 81; his religion, 68; and the Rising, 68
 Lawkland, 180, 267, 312
 Lawson family, 84, 116, 191, 266, 396, 400; of Brough, 176, 195, 260, 263, 312, 354; nuns, 351, 370, 372, 376, women, 393
 Lawson, Charles, 319, 395
 Lawson, Dorothy, 256
 Lawson, Mrs Dorothy, 264, 282
 Lawson, Elizabeth, 351
 Lawson, Henry, 264, 308
 Lawson, Sir Henry, 379
 Lawson, Jack, 395
 Lawson, Sir John, bart., and J.P., 319, 329, 331, 335
 Lawson, Sir John, and Catholic Commission, 369-70, 381-2
 Lawson, Mary (1) and (2), 351
 Lawson, Mrs, 255-6
 Lawson, Sir Ralph, 100, 129, 176, 263-4
 Lawson, Robert, 77
 Lawson, Roger, 264
 Laysthorpe, 104
 Layton family, 184, 189, 343
 Layton, Bartholomew, mission priest, 153-4
 Layton, Francis, rebel, 83
 Layton, John, S.J., 232, 235, 239, 292
 Layton, Mrs (1) and (2), recusant wives, 171
 Layton, Thomas, priest, 76
 Layton, Sir Thomas, J.P., 229, 230
 Layton, William, gent., 80, 104
 Leake, 62, 105, 179, 196, 244, 246; Catholic congregations, 257, 394; Danbys and, 267, 308, 309, 315, 331, 355; incidence of recusancy, 293, 418-19
 Lealholm, 181, 290
 Lechfelde, Sir Steven, 51
 Lee, Dr Roger, 80, and wife, 186, 187
 Leeming, 130
 Legard, Mr, J.P., 207
 Legge, Thomas (1535-1607), Master of Caius College, 135
 Legget, messenger, 322
 Lennox family of Settrington, 12
 Lennox, Earl of, 170, 178, 264
 Lennox, Lady, 45, 53, 65
 Lennox, Matthew Stewart, 4th Earl of (1516-71), 53, 64, 65, 66, 69
 Lepton family, 180, 273, 277
 Lepton, Ann, 277
 Lepton, Christopher, 77
 Lepton, Roger and George, rebels, 83
 Lepton, Thomas, 277
 Levisham, incidence of recusancy, 417
 Leyburn, 336, 358, 388, 390; Waites and, 175, 176, 239, 256, 263, 294, 304, 320, 339, 341, 344, 351, 354, 359; chapel, 390
 Leyburn, John (1620-1702), Vicar Apostolic, 342, 348, 353, 354; survey of Yorkshire priests, 341; tour of Yorkshire, 342-3
 Leyburn, Captain William, 308
 Liberalism, effect on Dissent, 365, 380; and reform of the Catholic Church, 380-1; and women's religious vocation, 392
 Liddell family, 399
 Linley, Sir Henry, J.P., 203
 Linton on Ouse, 260, 280, 313, 345; chapel and mission centre, 382, 390, 394
 Literature, Catholic, 252-3, 359-60
 Little Ayton, 64
 Little Danby by Yafforth, 60
 Little Hutton, 312
 Little Leake, 178

- Little Smeaton, 45; Grimstons and, 37, 44, 57, 60, 95, 178; Simpsons and, 276, 290
- Liverton, 81; incidence of recusancy, 424
- Lockwood family, 186, 191, 244, 274, 347; and Douai, 246, 316
- Lockwood, Clare, 212
- Lockwood, Christopher, 48, 87, 154
- Lockwood, Francis (d.1637), secular priest,
- Lockwood, John, priest, 154, 225, 247
154, 225, 247
- Lockwood, Matthew, 316
- Lockwood, Mrs, 316
- Lockwood, Richard, 274, 316
- Lockwood, Robert, priest, 234
- Lodge, Miles, priest, 32
- Lodge, Marmaduke, 280-1
- Lodge, Richard, 290
- Loftus, 81, 102, 322, 336, 356, 393, 398;
incidence of recusancy, 169, 181, 424;
missionary district, 382; chapel, 389;
Catholic congregations, 394
- Loftus, William, his will, 51
- Loggan, Mrs Ellen, 102
- Long Cowton, 83
- Long Parliament, and Wentworth, 228; and
Catholic movement, 283, 292-3, 296,
302-3, 306
- Louvain, 37, 41, 106; Augustinian Canon-
esses, 253, 256, 353
- Loveday, John, bookseller, 402
- Low Burton, 175
- Lowick family, 267, 276, 359
- Lowick, Lawrence, postulant, 233, 234,
240, 241
- Lumley, John Lumley, Lord (?1534-1609),
64, 68; imprisonment, 65, 67-8
- Lumley, Lord, 320, 336
- Lund, 80; Grange, 271
- Lythe, 38, 81, 102; Radcliffes and, 96,
130, 346, 356; Catholic families, 184,
396, 400; Catholic congregations, 255,
394; incidence of recusancy, 424-5
- Maire family, 336, 396; women, 393, 401
- Maire, Henry, 399
- Malham family, 186
- Mallory family, 186, 188, 205, 206
- Mallory, Sir John, Councillor of the North,
202
- Mallory, Sir William, 100-1
- Maltby, 181, 270
- Maltby, recusant, 95
- Malton, 11, 21, 27, 45, 64, 66, 120, 203,
246, 301; a mesne borough, 18;
incidence of recusancy, 104, 154,
410-11; Catholic families, 189-90,
203, 217, 229, 239; Catholic con-
gregations, 257, 394; lapsed families,
283; Eures and, 284, 318, 358; the
Bench in 1645, 302; seizure of popish
vestments, 317-18; political centre,
371; Burke and, 380
- Malton, George, curate, 28
- Manfield, 21, 32, 241, 268, 354; incidence
of recusancy, 170, 174, 435-6;
Catholic congregations, 257; Catholic
numbers, 393
- Manners family, 189, 284
- Marishes in Pickering, 307, 352
- Markenfield family, 69, 73; and the Rising,
82
- Markenfield, William, 92
- Markland, Fr., 163
- Marr, Thomas, informer, 125, 212, 216
- Marriages, clandestine, 148-50, 183, 185,
186, 227; efforts to save, 194-5; fines
for, 213; presentments for, 214; after
1660, 339, 377
- Marrick, 60, 78, 81, 266, 269, 310, 396;
incidence of recusancy, 171, 172, 438;
dower house, 259; sold by Bulmers,
353
- Marsh, John, priest, 349
- Marshall, Cuthbert, 95
- Marshall, Dr. Thomas, Dean of Christ-
church, 41, 78; in Douai, 54
- Marske, 63, 81, 99, 121, 203, 268;
incidence of recusancy, 76, 93, 99,
180, 425, 438; Rokebys and, 290;
Catholic congregations, 393
- Marske in Cleveland, 80, 118, 298
- Marton, 52, 290; incidence of recusancy,
180, 268, 278, 421
- Marton and Moxby, incidence of recusancy,
413
- Mary of Modena (1658-1718), Queen of
James II, Catholic household, 334-5,
339
- Mary Queen of Scots (1542-87), 40, 68
- Masham, 42, 45, 78, 239, 247, 355;
Churchwardens' accounts, 20, 22; and
Catholic monuments, 21, 22; and the
Rising, 22, 29, 82, 85; Danbys and,
72, 73, 90, 117, 121, 127, 149, 191,
213, 264; incidence of recusancy, 90-1,
97, 154, 169, 175, 176, 225, 260, 431;
Catholic congregations, 257; Nortons
and, 264; unlicensed teachers, 295;
Quakers and Papists, 344; Catholic
numbers, 293
- Mass, frequency of celebration, 387-8;
in house chapels, 388-91; peripatetic
missioners and, 389; in private houses,
391-2
- Mathew, Toby (1546-1628), Archbishop
of York, 207, 221; theological position,
208; and Thornborough, 208-9; his
dotage, 220, 222; Visitation Books,
222

- Mathew, Sir Toby (1577-1655), priest, 208
- Mauleverer family, 84, 205
- Mauleverer, William, Commissioner, 118, 126
- Maunby, 173
- May, John, priest, 347
- Mayes family, 399, 401
- Mayes, Nicholas, 397; buys Yarm, 310, 336
- Mayor, Anthony, apostate priest, 162
- Melsonby, 100; incidence of recusancy, 171, 172, 439
- Messenger, Mr, 401
- Metcalfe family, of Aldborough, 259; of Bear Park, 101, 175, 176, 191, 263; of Firby, 265, 316, 355; of Hornby, 263; of Kilburne, 191, 279; of Nappa, 41, 84, 116, 130, 159, 175, 402; of N. Otterington, 267, 311, 355; of Romanby, 267, 309, 331, 355; of Tanton, 326, 355, 399, 400
- Metcalfe, Anthony, barrister, 135, 170, 217, 232
- Metcalfe, Sir Christopher, 29, 41, 78, 87, 91, 101
- Metcalfe, George, 222, 228
- Metcalfe, Gilbert, 104, 185; estate seizure, 130-1, 355-6
- Metcalfe, Henry, 89
- Metcalfe, John (1), rebel, 83; (2), attorney, 354; (3), Jesuit, 239; (4), of N. Otterington, 292; (5), of Tanton, his will, 304
- Metcalfe, Leonard, 30, 54, 83, 84, 85, 89, 106, 274; his estate, 87
- Metcalfe, Mary (1), 222; (2), 393
- Metcalfe, Mr, priest, 332
- Metcalfe, Oswald (d. 1604), 83, 85, 87, 101, 176, 263
- Metcalfe, Peter, 318
- Metcalfe, Roger (1), 89, 175; (2), surgeon, 400
- Metcalfe, William (1) and (2), 83
- Metcalfe, Valentine, 179
- Metham family, 176, 187, 205, 270, 279, 285, 313, 357
- Metham, Francis, 103
- Metham, John, rebel, 83
- Metham, Sir Jordan, 237-8, 279, 288, 307
- Metham, Mrs Katherine, 319
- Metham, Sir Thomas, 221, 237
- Metham, William, Cromwell's agent, 237-8, 292-3, 307, 341
- Methodism, in N. Riding, 286
- Meynell family, of N. Kilvington, 74-5, 95, 178, 191, 246, 253, 265, 267, 326, 355, 396; sequestration papers, 313-15; and Cleveland, 355; domestic chaplains, 345; nuns etc., 351, 393; and heiresses, 399
- Meynell family, of Hawaby, 143, 185, 193, 269, 274; of Dalton, 259, 260, 326, 345, 346, 353, 355; of Pickhill, 265; of Hilton, 269, 356; of Broughton, 269, 356
- Meynell, Anthony (d. 1576), (1), 74; (2), Captain, 308; (3), s. of Thomas, 309
- Meynell, Cuthbert, 94
- Meynell, Edward, and Yarm, 389, 390
- Meynell, Elizabeth and Bridget, nuns, 351
- Meynell, George, 260, 313, 317, 326
- Meynell, John, (1) gs. of Thomas, at Douai, 297; (2), of Thornaby, 328; (3), of Broughton, 330
- Meynell, Mary (1), 356; (2), 351
- Meynell, Richard, 83, 95, 105, 171-2, 178
- Meynell, Robert (1) (d. 1563), 74, 77; (2), 242
- Meynell, Roger (1) (d. 1591), 75, 81, 83, 87, 94, 95, 104; (2), 326, 329, 331, 335
- Meynell, Thomas, 43, 45, 95, 144, 210, 277, 304-5; and recusancy fines, 125-7, 129, 130, 135, 212, 217, 287; evasion of estate seizure, 126-7, 217, 218, 220; his Book of Memoirs, 145, 191, 235, 242, 249, 256, 276, 286-7, 295; imprisonment, 145-6, 216 and clandestine marriage, 150, 249, 256; personal Catholicism, 191, 192; travel bonds, 200-1; and Oath of Allegiance, 215, 248; and Huddlestone, 241, 249; and Mount Grace chapel, 276; and racing, 287; and Civil War, 302, 309; sequestrators and, 314
- Meynell, Wilfred, rebel, 83
- Meynell, William, at Douai, 297, 341
- Middle classes, N. Riding Catholics, 400-1
- Middleburgh, and the priests' route, 159, 160
- Middleham, 12, 21, 47, 61, 63, 203, 258, 402; acquired by Scrope, 86, 218; sale of, 262; incidence of recusancy, 263, 429
- Middleham, Adam, J.P., 203
- Middlesbrough, 403; incidence of recusancy, 421
- Middleton, 272; incidence of recusancy, 417
- Middleton in Cleveland, 23
- Middleton in Hilton, 269
- Middleton on Leaven, 21, 47, 63, 269, 399, 400
- Middleton One Row, Co. Durham, 280
- Middleton Tyas, 46, 246, 247, 286, 354; incidence of recusancy, 170, 174, 436; Catholic congregations, 256
- Middleton family, landowners, 173-4, 261; of Leaven and Hilton, 356, 399, 400

- Middleton, (1) Sir Peter, 223 (2) Peter, 326, 329, 331
 Middleton, Mrs Richard, 176
 Middleton, Thomas, 218
 Mitchell family, 178, 265, 359; freeholders, 402
 Monastic properties, acquisition of by Catholics, 71, 72, 74, 128, 130, 185
 Moone, Jonathan, 335, 356
 Moore family, 356; origins, 229; and the Clerkship, 229, 322, 336, 351; troubled end, 398; lawyers, 400
 Moore, James, 232, 332
 Moore, Mary, 351, 393
 Moore, Thomas, s. of James, 229, 351
 Moore, William, 322, 331
 Moore, Zachary Steward, 398
 More, Francis, gent., 268
 More, Gertrude (1606-33), *Ideot's Devotions*, 359
 More, Thomas, priest, 47
 More, Thomas, clergy agent, 236, 243, 244, 251
 Moresholm, 290
 Morgan, Thomas, 209
 Morgan, William, land steward, 402
 Morley family, 274
 Morley, Cuthbert, 282
 Mortham, Rokebys and, 60, 80, 92, 112, 115, 117, 129, 170, 259, 353
 Morton, Dr Nicholas (*fl.* 1568), distinguished 'old priest', 31, 37, 46, 52, 53-4, 96
 Morton, Robert, 96
 Morton, Thomas (1564-1659), Bishop of Durham, 225, 227, 311
 Morton Grange, 268, 269, 275, 276
 Morton in Ormesby, 60
 Moulden family, freeholders, 402
 Moulton, 83, 150, 305, 320, 359
 Mount Grace, 24; pilgrimages to, 23, 275-7; Lady Chapel, 275
 Mount St John, Campion and, 58-9, 105; Harringtons and, 105, 150, 156, 185, 206, 272
 Mounteagle, William Lord, 128
 Mowthorpe, 187, 279
 Mudd, Thomas, Cistercian, 44
 Muker, 64, 402
 Mulgrave, 160, 180, 269; Radcliffes and, 78, 81, 118, 129-30, 179
 Mulgrave Castle, Sheffield and, 129-30, 161, 181, 199
 Mullinax, Mrs, 260
 Muscoats, 283; Bullocks and, 190, 309, 348, 358, 359, 396
 Musgrave, Sir Henry, J.P., 196, 201
 Musgrave, John, 358
 Musgrave, Sir Richard, 204
 Mush, John (1552-1617), 345; missionary, 61, 165, 238, 246; group leader, 158-9, 160; suspension, 166, 168, 247; and Wiseman, 167; leader of N. Appellants, 167, 247; his Sodality, 167-8; and the gentry's Catholicism, 180, 191-2, 193; and Schismatics, 194; *Life of Margaret Clitheroe*, 191, 192
 Mush, William, 345
 Myers, Sir Michael, 45
 Myton, 81, 89, 103
 Myton on Swale, 45; incidence of recusancy, 413
 Naburn, 256
 Nandyke, Thomas, chaplain, 389
 Nappa, 29, 41, 78, 83, 101, 161, 177
 Nateby, 334
 Nattres, Sir Humphrey, reconciler in Richmondshire, 40
 Naworth Castle, 67, 250, 281, 282
 Neal, Fr., 163
 Neile, Richard (1562-1640), Archbishop of York, and recusancy, 226, 227
 Nelson family, 87
 Nelson, John, missionary, 55, 59, 89, 152, 157
 Nelson, Martin, missionary, 54, 55, 57, 89, 152, 160
 Nelson, Mrs (1), 80; (2), 277
 Nelson, Thomas, missionary, 55, 56, 89, 152
 Nendyke, family, 273, 280, 299, 309
 Nendyke, Francis, 352
 Nendyke, Mrs, 272
 Ness, 268, 336, 358, 401; dower house, 281
 Nether Silton, 178, 267
 Neutralism, among 'old priests', 36-46 *passim*; among the laity, 75-7
 Nevill, Dr George, 40; his will, 51
 Neville, Lady Ann, 181
 Neville, Christopher (*fl.* 1569), 40, 64, 84
 Neville, Ralph, 277
 New Malton, 23, 377
 Newbiggin, Salvins and, 116, 268, 270, 272, 297, 303, 307, 313, 326, 336, 346, 356; Mass-house, 391
 Newburgh, Bellasis family and, 83, 98, 104, 118, 183, 193, 207, 228
 Newburgh Priory, 27, 184-5, 270, 357, 386, 388; chapel, 399; Fauconbergs and, 396-7
 Newby, 186, 191, 248, 255
 Newby Wiske, 331, 335, 354
 Newcastle, Henry Cavendish, 2nd Duke of (1630-91), 336
 Newcastle, Sir Thomas Pelham Holles, Duke of (1693-1768), 368
 Newsham, 353, 399, 400

- Newton, (Hallikeld), 130, 178, 265, 359
 Newton in Cleveland, 60; incidence of recusancy, 421
 Newton on Ouse, incidence of recusancy, 413
 Nicholson, Simon, priest, 332
 Nickson, Edward, schoolmaster, 293
 Nidd (Ripon liberty), 163, 338
 Nightingale, James, 154
 Nightingale, Richard, priest, 154, 239
 Norcliffe family, 203
 Norcliffe, Benjamin, J.P., 305
 Norcliffe, Sir Thomas, 305
 Normanby, 74, 359; incidence of recusancy, 270, 411
 Normanby in Cleveland, 275
 Normaville family, 176, 263
 North Kilvington, 194, 241, 256, 306, 342, 349; Meynells and, 74, 75, 83, 87, 95, 105, 125, 144, 171, 178, 215, 253, 313-15, 326, 345, 351; chapel, 390
 North Otterington, 63, 179, 267, 292, 311, 393; incidence of recusancy, 355, 419; Catholic congregations, 394
 Northallerton, 36, 46, 55, 62, 151, 152, 221, 228, 250, 304; a mesne borough, 18; and the Rising, 81, 82, 84; incidence of recusancy, 169, 276, 331, 419; Catholic congregations, 257, 394; and Civil War, 301, 302
 Northampton, Henry Howard Earl of (1540-1614), 205, 206
 Northumberland, Sir Henry Percy, 8th Earl of (?1532-85), 85-6, 92, 115, 116
 Northumberland, Sir Henry Percy, 9th Earl of (1564-1632), 116, 171
 Northumberland, Sir Hugh Percy (Smithson), Duke of (1715-86), 386
 Northumberland, Thomas Percy, 1st Earl of (1528-72), 12, 14, 44; and the Rising, 37, 65, 66-7, 68-9, 82; as landholder, 62-3, 64; under suspicion, 65; religious career, 66; his retinue, 68-9; execution, 84
 Norton (Malton), 203
 Norton Conyers, 72, 74; and the Rising, 27; Musgraves and, 203, 204, 348-9
 Norton family, 12, 54, 69, 72, 101, 354; acquisitions, 74; and the Rising, 82, 83; recusants, 176; and Cloubeck, 261; and Masham, 264, 265
 Norton, Basil, priest, 246
 Norton, Christopher, rebel, 84
 Norton, Edmund, 174
 Norton, Francis, rebel, 84
 Norton, John, gent., 52, 106
 Norton, Marmaduke, rebel, 93
 Norton (née Boynton) (1), Mrs, 261; (2), of Kirk Leavington, 356
 Norton, Richard (1499-1588), 74, 78, 84, 86, 92, 93
 Norton, Sampson, 84
 Norton, Thomas, rebel, 84
 Nosterfield, 265, 311
 Nunhouse, 72
 Nunnington, 99, 203, 371; incidence of recusancy, 104, 411
 Oath of Abjuration, 303, 307, 313, 316, 317
 Oath of Allegiance, Catholics and, 201, 202, 212, 214-15, 216, 230, 231, 235; Appellant crisis and, 247, 340; presentation in N. Riding, 247-8, 328, 333; recast after Revolution, 337; Catholic Relief Acts and, 380-2
 Oath of Supremacy, clergy and, 26, 134; Justices and, 77-8, 134; rebels and, 85; 'church papists' and, 88; and receipt of livery, 126, 128; enforced on those holding certain offices, 134-5, 202; lay executions and, 140; recast after Revolution, 327, 337
 O'Bryan, Brian, 338
 Oglethorpe, Sir Henry, 45
 Oglethorpe, Owen (d. 1559), Bishop of Carlisle, 25
 Old Byland, 81; incidence of recusancy, 414
 Old Chapter, and Church appointments, 340-1, 383
 Old Malton, 99
 Ormesby, 95, 102, 294; incidence of recusancy, 421-2
 Orton, Henry, 32
 Osbaldeston, Francis, priest, 332, 342
 Osballdwick, 411
 Osgodby, 163, 221, 246, 256, 271, 293, 356; Babthorpes and, 60, 129, 167, 194, 253, 254
 Osmotherley, 62, 152, 193, 332; 'monuments of superstition', 20, 21; Lowick family, 240, 267, 276; Franciscan convent, 276-7, 347; missionary district, 382; Friars' school, 385; Wesley and, 387; house chapel, 391; Catholic congregation, 394; incidence of recusancy, 394
 Oswaldkirk, 400; incidence of recusancy, 411; school, 294
 Otterburne, Robert, 288
 Oulston, 72, 186, 206, 290, 318, 378, 397; missionary district, 382; Mass-house, 392
 Over Dinsdale, 178
 Over Helmsley, 44, 54
 Over Silton, 77, 273, 392, 397; incidence of recusancy, 416

- Overton, 54, 80, 87, 150, 157, 352, 357;
Besleys and, 88, 103, 159, 239,
incidence of recusancy, 152, 187,
262, 413
Ovington, Alice, 145; marriage, 149
Ovington, John, 149
- Page, Anthony, priest, 141, 163
Pala, Robert, example of neutralism, 36
Palliser, Richard, 'Ignatian', 241
Palliser, Thomas, missionary, 147-8, 152-3
Panzani, Gregorio, Papal nuncio, 243; and
episcopal control, 249, 250
Parker, Richard, seminary priest, 165-6
Parker, William, vagrant Catholic, 284
Parkinson, Francis, 28, 94-5, 136
Parliamentarians, and Yorkshire Bench,
302-6, 317
Parlington, W. Riding, 278, 368, 386, 398
Passman, William, 391
Patrick Brompton, 91, 101; newcomers,
264-5; Catholic numbers, 393;
incidence of recusancy, 432
Pattinson, Bernard, priest, 165
Payler, John, J.P., 203
Pearson, William, priest, 341
Peart family, freeholders, 402
Pennyman, Jane, 102
Pennyman, Robert, rebel, 83, 84
Pennyman, Sir Thomas, J.P., 333
Pennyman, William, Protestant, 304
Pepper, Sir Cuthbert, J.P., 203
Pepper, Richard, rebel, 83
Pepper, William, Protestant, 76
Percehay family, 246, 272, 399
Percehay, Barbara, 399
Percehay, Christopher, J.P., 272, 304,
305, 307, 356, 399
Percehay, Richard, 184
Percehay, Thomas, 272
Percehay, William, 184; education, 294
Percy family, estates after the Rising, 85-6
Percy, John, ex-Jesuit, 165
Percy, Lady Mary, 254
Percy, Thomas, conspirator, 186, 206
Perkynson, Richard, his will, 51
Persons, Robert (1546-1610), 55; at Douai,
56; and the missionaries, 58; in England,
137, 158
Petre family, 400
Philip family, 81
Phillips, William, yeoman, 102, 159
Pibush, John, seminary priest, 150, 156
Pickering, 18, 61, 137, 184, 271, 302;
incidence of recusancy, 272, 417
Pickering Lythe, 62, 63, 81, 99, 215, 332;
incidence of recusancy, 105, 271,
417-18; Catholics in the Liberty,
183-4, 352, 356-7, 394; decline of
Cholmley power, 271
Pickering, John, 48
Pickhill, 83, 170, 178, 265-6; incidence of
recusancy, 433
Pickton, 269, 270, 356, 399, 400
Piercebridge by the Tees, 301
Piercehay, Christopher, 228
Pierson family, 399, 400
Pierson, Bradshaw, 395
Pierson, William, J.P., 335; house chapel,
391-2
Pigott family, 376, 401
Pigott, Nathaniel, 373, 401
Pigott, Ralph, 373
Pinchingthorpe, 80, 99
Pinckney family, 178, 267, 355, 396, 399
'Players of interludes', 193, 288-91, 318,
348
Plusgrave, Cuthbert, vagrant Catholic, 141,
142-3
Pontoise, Benedictine convent, 256, 352
Poole, Thomas, deprived priest, 32, 144
Poor Clares, 255, 256, 351, 393
Popish Plot, repercussions in N. Riding,
327-8, 231-3, 342
Postgate, James, 348
Postgate, Nicholas (d. 1679), priest-martyr
290, 332, 333, 341; at Ugthorpe, 346;
character and career, 348; Mass-house,
391
Potts, Bede, Benedictine priest, 372-3,
374, 384-5, 386
Potts, Luke, missionary priest, 375
Pracid, John, S.J., 329, 332; on York
Castle, 330-1
Presbyterians, viii, 325
Preston, Fr., Benedictine, 250
Preston, James and son, Clerks of the Peace,
359, 371
Preston, John, domestic chaplain, 27
Preston, Sir Thomas, 334
Priests, marriage of, 23; and the new
religious order, 24 ff.; and the Synodal
Articles, 26, 31, 32; and the Rising,
26, 27, 28, 29, 31 *passim*; variations in
ordination, 33; effect of Dissolution
on labour market, 33; conservative
leanings, 46-51, 52; their wills, 49-
51, 343; used as schoolmasters, 291;
seizure of, 318; increasing tolerance
towards, 375, 379
Priests, missionary, their outlook, 151,
155-8; on the N. Riding mission, 155,
158; life and work during 1603-42,
235 ff.; after 1642, 339-48; their
spirit, 348; 18th century arrests, 375-
6; position in the 18th century, 385
ff.; scholarship, 386
Priests, 'old' (or 'Marian') definition of,
33; Anglican authorities and, 33-4;

Priests, missionary—*cont.*

Catholic historians, and, 34-5;
neutrality among, 35-6; non-conform-
ists, 36-46; in exile, 140

Priests, secular, demands of the party,
164; arguments with Jesuits, 164, 166,
235; accusations against, 166-7;
English missions, 1603-42, 243 ff.;
organization, 245-6; Brotherhood of,
246; houses harbouring, 246-7;
battle with the regulars, 247 ff.,
340; indictment of, 249-50; apostates,
251; after 1663, 341 ff.

Priests, seminary, 34-5; in England, 54-8,
106; and the Riding, 87, 158; royal
Commissions against, 113; diverse
fate of, 137-8; in exile, 140; increase
in after 1582, 150 ff., 191; organiz-
ation, 158-9; 'underground' route for,
158, 159-60; rest-centres for, 158-9,
161-3; demands of their party, 164

Pringle, Dr James, 401-2

Privy Council, restrictive policy against
recusants, 11, 13, 97-8, 102, 159,
200, 219; and choice of President and
Councillors of the North, 115-16,
202; and Jesuits, 120; and recusancy
fines, 124, 130; attitude to execution,
138; and wardship, 224; and Crown
commissions, 230

Proctor, Sir Stephen, J.P., 119, 202; legal
battle within the Bench, 205-6

Protestantism, its advance stayed in York-
shire, 53; Sandys and, 108; and the
Universities, 135; use of its books and
texts, 139; Long Parliament and, 303

Protestants, dissenting movements, viii,
20; Marian exiles, 33; and 'old priests',
33-4; and the maintenance of faith,
49; their clerical wills, 50; among N.
Riding gentry, 75-6, 97, 175, 178,
180, 188; recusant wives of, 172; and
religious persecution, 200; among
Justices, 203; need for spiritual
guidance, 252; and education, 291;
and James II's Catholic household,
335; attitude to Dissent, 364-5

Puckering, Sir John (1544-96), 156

Pudsey family, 44, 84, 99, 101, 116, 170,
191; of Forcett, 92, 171, 246, 247,
353; landowners, 174; and Hackforth,
259, 261, 354; and Pickton, 269, 356,
399, 400; forced sale, 312

Pudsey, Ambrose, 209

Pudsey, Cuthbert, 170

Pudsey, Michael, 328, 331

Pudsey, Peter, 328

Pudsey, Stephen (1) 92; (2), 308

Pudsey, Thomas (1), (d. 1576) 92; (2),
legal adviser, 135, 261

Pudsey, Mrs Thomas, 116

Puritans and Puritanism, 113, 119, 172, 231,
271

Pursglove, Robert (?1500-79), Bishop of
Hull, 96; and Oath of Supremacy, 24,
25; his Grammar Schools, 30, 38,
107 n. 18, 109 n. 35; career, 37-9;
suspected 'neuter', 39-40, 42

Quakers, 8, 325, 343-4, 350-1

Quarter Sessions, 205; and recusancy fines,
122-5, 232; and informers, 211;
Wentworth and, 227-8, 251, 254;
in abeyance, 234; and the Worsleys,
284-5; and Catholic actors, 290;
postwar proceedings, 317-18; post-
Restoration proceedings, 324, 328,
331-3; post-Revolution proceedings,
336-7

Radcliffe family, 84, 191; landowners, 171,
179, 180; wardship of, 225; of
Ugthorpe, 269, 356; freeholders, 402

Radcliffe, Francis, 130

Radcliffe, Katherine, 130, 160, 180, 184,
269

Radcliffe, Roger (d. 1587-8), J.P., 78, 81,
96, 118, 129; his will, 129-30

Radcliffe, Roger, gs. of above, 129

Rainer, Robert, M.D., 270

Rainton, 186

Raskelf, 81

'Ratcliffe, Mother', 255

Rawlins, Alexander, missionary, 114, 156,
157, 160; and Warcop, 163; and
Holtby, 165; and the Queen, 167

Raynes, George, priest, ordained by Tuns-
tall, 44

Raynes, Thomas, J.P., 335

Raysin family, 104, 189, 246, 283

Raysin, Marmaduke, 189-90, 272

Raysin, Mrs, 190

Readman family, 180, 181, 269

Readman, Marmaduke, 69

Readshaw family, 181, 199

Readshaw, Alice, 186

Readshaw, Christopher, 186

Readshaw, William, 186

Rebellion of '15, Statutes resulting from,
366-7; Catholics and, 404 n. 1

Rebellion of '45, N. Riding Catholics and,
368-70

Recusancy Commission, 1626-7, its duties,
219-20, 222; 1628, Strafford and, 223,
225-33; revenues from, 232

Recusant Rolls, 129, 130, 131, 218, 326

Redheads (1), gaolers of York Castle, 132,
142; (2), mercers, 390, 402

Redhead, Stephen and Henry, 370

Reeth, 64

- Regulars, the, and Appellant crisis, 247, 340-1; and Oath of Allegiance, 247-8; Smith's indictment of, 248-9; Panzani and, 249, 250; Vicars Apostolic and, 383
- Reresby, Sir John, Governor of York, 334, 336
- Reresby, Sir Thomas, Councillor of the North, 202
- Reyner, Clement, Benedictine, 249-50
- Reynoldson, John, grocer, 402
- Richmond, 11, 25, 36, 40, 46, 48, 80, 239, 247; its Archdeaconry and recusancy, 16-26, 147; Metropolitan's visitation, 16, 25; its self-government, 17; religious disciplinary measures, 17; search for superstitious 'monuments', 21; survival of Catholic customs, 23; Nicholas' Hospital, 25; clerical wills, 51, 52; Crown property, 61; Northumberland property, 63; and the Rising, 82, 83, 84; acquired by Scrope, 86, 218; incidence of recusancy, 89, 172-3, 427-8; Huntingdon's drive against recusants, 98, 99-105; dowagers, 260; mission priests, 346; Catholic gentry, 353-4, 399; mission district, 382, 385, 387; Mass-houses, 391; Catholic population, 393
- Richmondshire, 31, 44; Reconcilers in, 37, 40, 45, 46, 136; and the Rising, 69, 84; its Justices, 78-9; Scropes and, 86, 218, 258; drive against recusants, 99 ff.; priests' rest-centres, 163; impact of Catholicism on, 169 ff.; Civil War and, 301; Sequestration Committee, 314; Meynell estates, 326; decline of its Catholicism, 355; Catholic predominance, 393
- Rickaby, John, linen manufacturer, 402
- Rider, Robert, farmer, his will, 343, 346
- Riddle, Ralph, 390
- Riding, East, deprived priests, 53; landowning in 62, 178; gentry, 69-70; and the Rising, 81; recusants, 99, 153, 194; priests' rest-centres, 163; martyrs, 187; its Bench and Catholic conspiracy, 206; repression of Catholics after 1660, 323, 325; Land Tax, 337-8; Catholic estates, 366
- Riding, North, its Justices, 12, 78-9, 117-19, 121, 202-7, 221, 228, 229, 303, 320, 333, 335-6, 338; deprived clergy and schoolmasters, 24-33, 53; contact with Catholic exiles, 53, 54; landowning influences in, 61 ff.; turnover of land after the Rising, 85; selection of President and Councillors of the North, 115-17; administrative unrest, 118 ff.; evidence of recusancy fining and estate seizure, 125-31; numbers summoned for Catholic offences, 146-7; Catholic dissension and its mission, 164-9; increase of Catholics in, 169 ff., 200; Catholic estates in, 175 ff.; numbers of Catholics in, 1603-42, 257-85, 306; 1642-1702, 352-9, 396, 18th century, 382-7; Civil Wars and, 301-10, 318; mission stations, 1642-1702, 344-51; 18th century, 382-7; Catholic distribution by estate value, 366; celebration of Mass, 387-8
- Riding, West, 60, 241; 'old priests', 34; deprived priests, 53; landowning influences, 62, 173; gentry, 69-70; and the Rising, 81; recusants, 99, 180, 186; priests' rest-centres, 163; and Oath of Allegiance, 329; Land Tax, 337-8; taxes on Catholic estates, 366, 372
- Ridley family, 267
- Ripgarth, 29
- Ripley, 78, 149, 186, 255; churchyard dancing, 289
- Ripon, 12, 78, 85, 99, 203, 206, 268, 354; Liberty of, 163, 178
- Rishton, Edward, missionary, 56
- Rivers, Thomas Savage, 3rd Earl, 258
- Rivett, John, priest, 378
- Robertes, Mrs Jane, her illegitimate children, 286
- Robinson, Christopher, deprived 'old priest', 32
- Robinson, George (Fairfax), Benedictine, 374
- Robinson, John, 230, 231; his education, 293
- Robinson, Sir Metcalfe, J.P., 336
- Robinson, Richard, curate, 380
- Robinson, Robert, 238
- Robinson, William, J.P., 203
- Rockingham, Charles Watson-Wentworth, Marquess of (1730-82), 66, 371, 380
- Roecliffe, 311
- Rokeby, 78, 81, 101, 203; Catholic congregation, 170; incidence of recusancy, 439
- Rokeby family, 84, 101, 117, 180, 259, 268, 353, 359, 399
- Rokeby, Anthony, J.P., 78
- Rokeby, Christopher, 112, 115
- Rokeby, Francis, 259
- Rokeby, Fr., Benedictine, 379; his school, 385
- Rokeby, James, 100
- Rokeby, John, Vicar General of York, 12, 38, 59, 60, 81, 92, 101, 117, 137
- Rokeby, John (1) (d.1595), 129, 170; (2), 353
- Rokeby, Mr, 54

- Rokeby, Ralph (1), 80; (2), 290; (3), 402
- Rokeby, Richard, 353
- Rokeby, Robert, J.P., 93, 99, 118, 121
- Rokeby, Thomas, 78, 80
- Rokeby, Sir Thomas, s. of John (1), 170-1
- Romaldkirk, 25; Catholic congregations, 393; incidence of recusancy, 439
- Romanby, 82, 267, 331, 332, 345, 355
- Rome (Holy See), and the secular-regulars quarrel, 235-6; and English Benedictines, 239; divides England into Vicariates, 344; and Vicars Apostolic, 383
- Rome, English College, 144, 154, 155, 163, 166, 173, 189, 204, 209, 253, 294; English Hospice, 37; Yorkshire Catholic exiles, 54-8
- Ross family, 190, 277
- Rouse, ?Anthony, sometime apostate, 251
- Rowntree family, 102
- Rowntree, Leonard, apostate priest, 208, 251
- Roxby, 83; Cholmleys and, 69, 71, 110, 269
- Rudby, 191, 215, 248
- Rudby in Cleveland, incidence of recusancy, 422
- Runswick Bay, priests' landing place, 162
- Rushton, Fr., 329
- Rushworth, John (?1612-90), 220; agent to Catholic gentry, 306, 310, 311, 312
- Russell family, 119
- Rutland family, 176
- Rutland, Edward Manners, 3rd Earl of (1549-87), 64, 75, 116
- Rutland, Francis Manners, 6th Earl of (1578-1632), 248, 284
- Rutland, Henry Manners, 2nd Earl of (d. 1563), 53, 64; President of the North, 115
- Ryedale, 81, 99, 185; incidence of recusancy, 104, 147, 188, 269, 272, 357; 409-11; number of Catholics, 281-5, 394
- Rydyard, John, 83
- Rymer, Ralph, J.P., 300, 301, 310, 311; life of, 304, 305
- Rymer, Simon, gent., 270
- Rymer, Thomas (1641-1713), *Foedera*, 304
- Ryther, John, and Oath of Allegiance, 329, 331; and apprehended priests, 332, 333
- Ryton, 272; Percehays of, 184, 228, 246, 304, 305, 307, 356, 399
- St. Omer, Jesuit school, 188, 237, 238, 239, 292, 293, 294, 296, 395; English nuns and, 255
- Salford, New Fleet prison, 133, 190
- Salkeld family, 354
- Salisbury, Sir Robert Cecil, Earl of (?1563-1612), 41, 68, 77, 155, 193, 207, 209; death, 201
- Saltmarsh family, 354, 396
- Saltmarsh, Edward (d. 1689), sheriff's deputy 211, 306; and Meynell estate, 314; J.P., 335
- Saltmarsh, Philip, J.P., 335
- Salton, incidence of recusancy, 411
- Salven, Robert, rector, 35
- Salvin family, 116, 268-9, 270, 272, 356, 371, 391, 392, 399; billeting accounts, 302
- Salvin, Anthony, deprived priest, 40, 42
- Salvin, John, 102
- Salvin, Ralph and family, 102, 180
- Salvin, Richard, 24, 42, 96, 102; his will, 51
- Salvin, Thomas (1), 383, 395; (2), 401
- Salvin, William, 336; and Civil War, 307, 313
- Sampson, Christopher, 238; his education, 292
- Sanderson, John, schoolteacher, 295
- Sandhutton, 187, 203, 279
- Sandys, Edwin (?1516-88), Archbishop of York, 58, 66, 92, 94, 119; and recusancy, 13, 98, 100; 'old priest', 33; and the laity's religion, 77; and religious persecution, 113, 114, 200, 365; and N. Riding Justices, 117
- Saunders, Sir Edward, 51
- Saunderson, escapee, 142
- Savile, Conyers, 190
- Savile, Sir John, 212, 222, 350; and Recusancy Commission, 220, 287
- Saville, Thomas, Protestant, 76
- Saxton, 45, 348, 374
- Saye and Sele, William Fiennes, 1st Viscount (1582-1662), and 3rd Viscount Fairfax, 283
- Sayer family, 116, 152, 172, 181, 259, 267, 355; sold up, 310
- Sayer, John, 78, 95, 117, 220, 310; recusancy fine, 129
- Sayer, Lawrence (d. 1658), 308, 310, 318; his son, 310
- Sayer, Lieut. Col., 308
- Scackleton, 183, 190, 301, 311, 342, 352
- Scalby, incidence of recusancy, 418
- Scarborough, ix, 12, 72, 136, 237, 328, 335, 370; self-government, 17; religious disciplinary measures, 17-18; import of Catholic objects, 53; Church attendance, 96-7; incidence of recusancy, 102, 271, 427; Hoby and, 120, 271; religious state, 183-4; Grammar School, 271, 294; Church

Scarborough—*cont.*

- and State in, 271; mission priests, 347; Catholicism in (after 1660), 382; missionary district, 382; Mass-houses, 391; Catholic congregations, 394; as a Spa, 394; Catholic families, 396, 402
- Scarborough Castle, Civil Wars and, 301, 302, 308, 318; Crosland as Governor, 319, 343, 356; Fox imprisoned in, 343
- Scargill, 118, 170; Tunstall Jesuits, 237, 339
- Scawton, 81, 359, 384, 402; Catholic congregations, 394; incidence of recusancy, 411
- Schoolmasters, and religious tests, 26–31, 32; and Oath of Supremacy, 134; licencing of, 144; Catholic, 176–7, 288, 291–7; Statute against, 377; mission priests, 385
- Scorton, 305
- Scott, Mountford, seminary priest, 141
- Scott, Thomas, vicar, 46
- Scrope family, 51, 116, 246, 338, 354, 396; recusants, 101, 174, 177; landowners, 170, 175, 258, 261, 370; break up of estates, 258, 401; and Catholicism, 262; chapels, 389, 390; nuns, 393
- Scrope, Lady Catherine, 182, 183
- Scrope, Mrs Dorothy, 194, 262
- Scrope, Emmanuel Scrope, Lord (later Earl of Sunderland) (1584–1630) President of the North, 211, 213–15, 218, 220–2
- Scrope, Christopher, 262
- Scrope, Francis (d. 1626), 175, 194, 211–12, 262
- Scrope, Francis, b. of Henry (2), 262, 273; his education, 294
- Scrope, Henry (d. 1590), 90, 101, 117; (2), 262, 263
- Scrope, Henry Scrope, Baron (1534–92), 14, 62; landowner, 63, 64, 73, 81, 86; and the Rising, 67, 82; his religion, 68; and Council of the North, 116
- Scrope, Henry Joseph, 401
- Scrope, John, 262–3
- Scrope, Simon (d. 1691), 313, 318, 326; and lead mining, 354
- Scrope, Simon, s. of above, J.P., 335; and lead mining, 353; debts, 401
- Scrope, Simon, 381, 401
- Scrope, Thomas, 263
- Scrope, Thomas Scrope, 10th Baron and Council of the North, 116
- Scruton, 73; incidence of recusancy, 432
- Seamer, 23, 63, 76, 81; incidence of recusancy, 95, 272, 417, 422
- Sedgwick, Dame Alice, 40, 89
- Sedgwick, Lucy, her Catholic school, 101, 173
- Sedgwick, Dr Thomas (d. 1573), non-conformist ‘old priest’, 40, 41, 51
- Selby, Thomas William, 399
- Sessay, 51, 117, 118, 210; incidence of recusancy, 118, 419
- Settrington, 12, 34, 64
- Sexhow, 76, 229
- Sharpe, James, S.J., 237
- Shaw family, freeholders, 402
- Sheen Anglorum, 24, 275
- Sheffield, Edmund Sheffield, 3rd Lord (?1564–1646), 281; and Mulgrave Castle, 129–30, 181, 199; and Grosmont, 161, 199; President of the North, 199–200, 201, 202, 204; and recusant fines, 211, 212; use of priest-catchers, 216; replaced by Scrope, 218
- Sheffield, Sir William, J.P., 203
- Sheppard, Mr, 390
- Sherburne, Edward and son, 209
- Sherburne, Richard, 325
- Sheriff, the, difficulties of his job, 210; Catholic connections, 210; deputies, 210–11; Wentworth and, 231; and Catholic persecution, 233
- Sheriff Hutton, 116, 281, 377, 402; Church-wardens’ accounts, 20; incidence of recusancy, 89, 414; and Civil War, 302, 308
- Sheriff Hutton Castle, gaol for recusant wives, 131, 132
- Shrewsbury, George Talbot, 6th Earl of (?1528–90), President of the North, 115, 176
- Siclemor, John, priest, 165
- Sidney, Mrs Margaret, later Lady Hoby, 119
- Silton, 355, 399
- Simpson family, 276
- Simpson, Christopher, 290
- Simpson, Cuthbert, John and Richard, actors, 290
- Simpson, Robert, ‘player of interludes’, 193, 289, 290
- Simpson, Thomas, schoolteacher, 293
- Sinnington, 63, 272; incidence of recusancy, 418
- Sizergh, 246, 280, 320
- Skelton, 43, 63, 81, 87, 149, 193, 206, 304, 316, 326; incidence of recusancy, 102, 187, 425; Catholic congregations, 394
- Skelton, Edmund, curate, 51
- Skewsby, 72, 309, 311, 336
- Slater, Mr, priest, 338–9
- Slingsby, incidence of recusancy, 411
- Slingsby family, 266, 273, 388, 400
- Slingsby, Sir Henry, Councillor of the North, J.P., sheriff, 202, 204, 210

- Smith family, of Lealholm, 181; of Egton, 269, 293, 359, 393, 396; of Snainton, 357, 359
- Smith, Francis, runagate papist, 45
- Smith, James (1645-1711), Bishop of Calliopolis, 342, 382; his chaplaincies and districts, 344-8, 349
- Smith, John, 312
- Smith, Joshua, merchant, 402
- Smith, Richard, gent., 102
- Smith, Richard (1566-1655), Bishop of Chalcedon, 235-6, 237, 238, 243, 251; list of Benedictines, 242; and Oath of Allegiance, 248; indicts the regulars, 248, 249; and the chaos in Catholicism, 248-9; pact with Benedictines, 250; rules from France, 340
- Smith, William, 43
- Smithson family, 174, 246, 259, 260, 266, 305, 320, 354, 359; of Newsham, 353, 400; women, 393
- Smithson, Calvert, 327, 328
- Smithson, George, J.P., 217
- Smithson, Sir Hugh, J.P., 335, 397, 401; and Stanwick, 259, 316, 353; baronet, 353; apostate, 397-8
- Smithson, Jeremy, 327
- Smithson, John, naval chaplain, 150-1, 167
- Smithson, John (d. 1684), secular priest, 346, 349-50
- Smithson, Leonard, rebel, 83
- Smithson, Robert, schoolteacher, 295
- Smithson, shelterer of priests, 159
- Snainton, 312, 357; Catholic congregations, 394
- Snape, 63, 100, 116, 318; and the Rising, 68
- Sneaton, 181, 290; incidence of recusancy, 102, 182, 183, 426
- Society of Jesus (*see also* Jesuits), its strength in England (1603-42), 236-39, 243; suppressed in 1778, 383
- Sockburne, 84, 255, 266; incidence of recusancy, 179, 267, 419
- South Cave, 127, 149, 191, 223, 264
- South Cowton, 47
- South Holme, 190, 283, 309, 358
- South Kilvington, 20-1, 27, 48; incidence of recusancy, 169, 415; Bramhall and, 221, 250
- South Otterington, 62, 152-3; incidence of recusancy, 104, 143, 185, 274, 414
- South Shields, Jesuit priests and, 159, 168
- South Stainley, 334, 345
- Southcott family, 335
- Southcott, Lady, 330, 339; marries Nicholas Fairfax, 333
- Sowerby, 79, 154, 274, 318, 322, 346-7; Lockwoods and, 48, 186, 212, 234, 316, 357; Christmas play, 290; Lascelles and, 86, 244, 261
- Spence family, 101
- Spence, George and Mary, 212
- Spence, Mrs, vagrant Catholic, 176
- Spennithorne, 194, 262; incidence of recusancy, 174, 175, 176, 429; Catholic congregations, 393
- Spiller, Sir Henry, and favours to recusants, 217
- Sproxtton, 80, 104, 184, 189, 278, 285, 348, 358
- Stafferton, Francis, accused of immorality, 166
- Stainley Hall, 349; Benedictines and, 345
- Stainsby, 180, 268, 290
- Stainton, 26, 51, 268, 356; incidence of recusancy, 95, 422
- Staithes, 290
- Stakesby, 269, 270, 356
- Standeven, John, proctor, 209; family, 54
- Stanfield, Mr, 401
- Stanhope, Sir Edward (?1546-1608), 145-6, 216
- Stanhope, Sir John, Councillor of the North, *Custos Rotulorum*, 119
- Stanwick, 78, 225, 289, 327, 335; incidence of recusancy, 170; Cattericks and 195, 244, 247, 259, 309, 315-16; Catholic numbers, 260, 398; Smithson family, 353, 397-8; Catholic families, 400
- Stanwick St. John, 51, 154, 241; incidence of recusancy, 93, 169, 439; Catholic congregations, 258, 393
- Stapleton, 20, 176, 259, 161, 312, 354
- Stapleton family, 176, 306, 307; and Clints, 381, 389, 396; of Bedale, 396
- Stapleton, Sir Miles (1628-1707), his trial, 333, 365
- Stapleton, Mr (of Carlton), 141
- Stapleton, Robert (1), apostate Benedictine, 251; (2), 260
- Stapleton, Sir Philip (1603-47), 306
- Stapleton, Thomas (1535-98), 66
- Stapper, Henry, deprived fellow of University College, 43-4
- Star Chamber, 137, 205; and 'jigs', 193; and Gunpowder Plot, 206; prosecutes Heaton, 204-5, 211-12
- Startforth, 81; incidence of recusancy, 440
- Statutes and Acts of Parliament (against Catholics), concerning recusancy, 122, 123, 124, 134, 136-8, 139-40, 202; *Premunire*, 136, 139, 140, 212, 214, 328, 331; use of house chapels, 138-46; treason (ordination abroad), 139, 157; harbouring, 145; Oath of Allegiance, 201, 202, 212, 214-15; penal statutes, 1603-10, 212-15;

- Statutes and Acts of Parliament—*cont.*
 Charles I's Parliament and, 219; of William III's reign, 288-9; between 1715-23, 366-7; against priests (1700), 385
- Stawle, Nicholas, refused licence to teach, 27
- Stay House, 387, 392
- Stearsby, 310, 311, 394; Catholic families, 400, 402
- Steel, Michael, 'jig' concerning, 193
- Stillington, incidence of recusancy, 103, 414
- Stittenham, 76, 84
- Stockton on Forest, incidence of recusancy, 414
- Stokesley, 36, 154, 335; incidence of recusancy, 99, 102, 204, 275, 422; and the Rising, 82, 83, 84; Fosters and, 232, 238, 256, 269, 304, 346, 355; Catholic congregations, 257, 394; interlude players, 295, Quakers and Catholics, 344; hostility to Catholics, 375; missionary district, 382; Mass-house, 391; Catholic families, 399, 402
- Stonegrave, 104, 358, 360; incidence of recusancy, 189, 285, 411
- Stonehouse, Andrew, S.J., 239, 292
- Stonehouse, Ann, 249, 256
- Stonehouse, Christopher, 255
- Stonor family, 400
- Strafford, Sir Thomas Wentworth, Earl of (1593-1641), President of the North, 222-3; Catholic connections, 223; and Catholicism, 223-4; and the Fairfax son, 224-5; and Recusancy Commission, 225-7, 230-3, 280-1, 284, 285; use of Quarter Sessions, 227-8, 284; J.P.s. and, 229-30; and recusant revenues, 232; his ruin, 233; and wardship of Sunderland's daughters, 258; and Fairfax, 282
- Strangways family, 182
- Strangways, James, 102, 182
- Strangways, Margaret, 102, 183
- Strangways, Mrs (d. by 1613), 268
- Strangways, William and wife, 180
- Streatlam, 93, 96, 170, 204
- Strensall, incidence of recusancy, 103, 414
- Strickland family, 246, 280, 336; after 1688, 339, 347, 357, 399; and Jacobitism, 369-70
- Strickland, Francis (d. 1745), 369-70
- Strickland, Mannock, 370
- Strickland, Sir Robert (d. 1707), 280, 334, 339, 355
- Strickland, Roger, Archdeacon of Yorkshire, 245
- Strickland, Roger, s. of Sir Roger, 370
- Strickland, Sir Roger (1640-1717), Admiral and J.P., 319, 320, 334, 369; attained, 339
- Strickland, Sir Thomas, of Sizergh, 320
- Strickland, Sir Thomas (1563-1612), sheriff, 202, 210
- Strickland, Walter, 78
- Strickland, Sir William, 228
- Sturdy family, freeholders, 402
- Sturdy, John, farmer, 402
- Sturdy, Mary, and Popish Plot, 327-8
- Sunderland, Emmanuel Earl of (d. 1628), his daughters, 258
- Sutton on the Forest, 81, 89, 103, 273; incidence of recusancy, 414
- Sutton under Whitestone Cliff, 185, 274; incidence of recusancy, 416
- Sussex, Thomas Radcliffe, Earl of (1526-83), President of the North, 12, 115; and the Rising, 85
- Swale family, 175, 191, 263, 266, 345, 358, 359
- Swale, Sir Richard (?1545-1608), Fellow of Caius, 135
- Swale, Sir Solomon, J.P., 175-6, 295, 305, 312, 320, 335; baronet, 319; sheriff, 320; and Duke of York, 334; and Swale Hall, 345; chaplains, 349; his will, 361
- Swale, Sir Henry, 349
- Swale, Dr. Robert, 349
- Swales, Peter, recusant wife, 285
- Swinburne, Sir Henry, ecclesiastical judge, 209
- Swinburne, Lady, 395
- Swinburne, Tobias, s. of Sir Henry, 209
- Sykes, Edmund, seminary priest, 137
- Symson, Clement, shopkeeper, 402
- Sysson, James, informer, 125
- Talbot family, 95, 153, 185, 188, 253, 267, 274, 291
- Talbot, Col. John, 309
- Talbot, Mary, laysister, 256
- Talbot, Roger (1), 95, 144; (2), 304
- Talbot, Thomas, rebel, 83, 104
- Tanfield, 305, 307
- Tankard family, 246, 265, 341; feud with Meynells, 143; sell Brampton, 311; and Douai, 348
- Tankard, Charles, (1), S.J., 154-5, 167; (2), of Whixley, 187,
- Tankard, Christopher, J.P., 333
- Tankard, Elizabeth, her will, 404 n. 2
- Tankard, Sir Henry, J.P., 124, 203, 204
- Tankard, James, 212
- Tankard, Lady Mary, 326
- Tankard, Ralph (1), rebel, 83; (2), of Arden, 143, 154, 185

- Tankard, Thomas, (d. 1597), 128, 177, 186
 Tankard, Sir Thomas (d. 1663), s. of above,
 128-9, 218, 246-7; recusancy com-
 position, 265; baronet, 319
 Tankard, William (1), J.P., 78-9, 204;
 (2), schoolmaster, 296
 Tankard, Sir William, 326
 Tankred family, 371-2, 393; house chapel,
 398
 Tankred, Charles, 401
 Tankred, Mrs and Miss, 395
 Tankred, Sir Thomas (1), J.P., 335, 349;
 (2), 374-5; (3), ?apostate, 398
 Tankred, Walter, and the, 15, 404 n.1
 Tankred, Sir William, J.P., 335
 Tanton, 130, 270, 274, 304, 326, 399, 400
 Tate family, freeholders, 402
 Tatham, John Bede, Benedictine, 350-1
 Taylor, 'old priest', 45
 Taylor, Mrs, Puritan, 172
 Taylor, Richard, secular priest, 245
 Taylor, Ursula, 159
 Taylor, William, deprived for marriage, 25,
 31
 Teady, papist, 159
 Tempest family, 400
 Tempest, Francis Augustine, chaplain, 350
 Tempest, John, 395
 Tempest, Lady, 333
 Tempest, Mrs, 395
 Tempest, Robert, 58
 Tempest, Stephen Walter, 395
 Tempest, William, 395
 Terrington, 81, 103; incidence of recusancy,
 414
 Tessimond, Mr, of York, 53
 Theaker, John, J.P., 201
 Theakston, Sir Richard, J.P., 126, 177, 203
 Thimbleby, Matthew, priest, 346
 Thirkelby with Osgodby, 83, 296; incidence
 of recusancy, 416
 Thirntoft, 80, 83, 173, 261
 Thirsk, 20, 43, 45, 104, 150, 203, 302,
 331; a mesne borough, 18; concealed
 Catholic fittings, 21; Bell and, 28, 48;
 and the Rising, 81, 82, 83, 84; inci-
 dence of recusancy, 94, 171, 185, 186,
 277, 416; informers, 125, 234;
 Catholic congregations, 394; Catholic
 families, 396, 401, 402
 Thomlinson family, 357
 Thompson, Christopher and Francis, solicit-
 ors, 271
 Thompson, James, seminary priest, 137
 Thompson, John, 'demi-Jesuit', 237
 Thompson, Roger, vicar, 24
 Thoresby (Aysgarth), 402
 Thoresby family, 175, 263
 Thoresby, John, 153
 Thoresby, Mrs, recusant wife, 171
 Thoresby, Ralph (1658-1725), 153, 360-1
 Thoresby, Thomas, missionary, 148, 170,
 153, 175
 Thoresby, William and wife, 90, 100
 Thormanby, 81; incidence of recusancy, 414
 Thornaby, 83, 328, 356
 Thorneley, Durham, priests' refuge, 160
 Thorney, Henry, vagrant Catholic, 181
 Thornborough family, 390, 396
 Thornborough, John (1551-1641), Bishop
 of Worcester, his career, 208-9;
 and recusants, 209, 210, 211, 212,
 217, 219, 268, 277
 Thornton family, 189, 285
 Thornton, Mrs Alice, 358, 360, 365
 Thornton, Edward, 104
 Thornton, Robert, 285
 Thornton, William (1), 104; (2), 285
 Thornton Bridge, Stricklands and, 202, 246,
 280, 339, 347, 355, 357
 Thornton-le-Beans, 23, 275, 276
 Thornton-le-Dale, 63, 72, 182, 184, 272;
 incidence of recusancy, 418
 Thornton-le-Moor, 63
 Thornton-le-Street, 83, 124, 144, 247,
 256, 291, 304, 309; incidence of
 recusancy, 169, 178, 185, 267, 419;
 Catholic congregations, 257, 394
 Thornton-on-the Hill, 72
 Thornton Steward, 90, 399, 400; Catholic
 congregations, 393; incidence of
 recusancy, 429-30
 Thornton Watlass, 83, 97; incidence of
 recusancy, 83, 97, 432
 Thornton Woods, priests' resting place,
 162-3, 168
 Thorold, Captain and servants, leave Eng-
 land, 330
 Thorpe, 258; sale of, 312
 Thorpe Perrow, 72-3, 223, 264
 Thorpe, Christopher, 149
 Thorpe, Marmaduke, vagrant Catholic,
 284
 Thorpfield, 277
 Throxenby in Scalby, 63
 Thurloe, John (1616-68), 312
 Thwaites family, 190
 Thwaites, Elizabeth, nun, 256
 'Thweng, Mr.' of Heworth, 309
 Thwing family, 238-9, 244-5, 270, 278,
 356, 357, 399
 Thwing, Ann, 141
 Thwing, Edward (1), 156; (2), J.P., 335;
 (3), coal merchant, 402
 Thwing, Frederick, 306
 Thwing, George, s. of William, 278, 317;
 his children, 278-9, 313; at Osgodby,
 293
 Thwing, Helen, nun, 351

- Thwing, Ingram, rebel (at Douai), 54, 55, 68, 84, 87, 103, 106
- Thwing, John, rebel (at Douai), 44, 54, 55, 84, 87, 106, 278
- Thwing, Katherine, 103
- Thwing, Robert (1) S.J., 238; (2) of Heworth, 215, 248
- Thwing, Thomas, 209, 278
- Thwing, Thomas (d. 1680), priest-martyr, 245, 279, 331, 332, 333, 341, 346
- Thwing, Thomas, secular missionary, 245, 247, 341, 346, 347
- Thwing, William 55, 187, 278
- Thynne, Mrs Elizabeth, 103, 187
- Tirry, Michael, schoolmaster, 29, 31, 106, 136
- Tocketts, 180, 268
- Tocketts family, 95-6, 160, 180, 211, 268, 356
- Tocketts, George, 96, 212, 294
- Tocketts, Richard, 96
- Tocketts, Robert, 294
- Tocketts, Roger (1), 96, 102, 109 n. 35 (2), 268
- Tocketts, Thomas, 160
- Tocketts, William, 313
- Todd, William, Prebendary of Durham, 36
- Tomlin, Francis, 290
- Topcliffe, 23, 28, 32, 37, 44, 55, 154, 301; Northumberland estates, 63, 206; Grange of Baldersby, 74; and the Rising, 81; incidence of recusancy, 95, 105, 186, 417
- Topcliffe, Richard (1532-1604), 112
- Topham family, 101, 175, 262, 266, 354; freeholders, 402
- Topham, Edward, and son Edward, 175
- Topham, Edward, s. of Francis, 262
- Topham, Francis, 262
- Topham, Lieut. Col. Henry, 308
- Towneley family, 257, 258, 264, 265
- Towneley, Richard, 329
- Towthorpe, 278
- Trapps, Francis, 338
- Trotter family, 261, 268, 306, 316
- Trotter, Edward, 326
- Trotter, George, J.P., 305
- Trotter, Richard, Protestant, 304
- Trotter, Robert, gent., 99, 180
- Troutbeck, Dr John, 306
- Tunstall, 21, 27, 42, 176
- Tunstall family, 118, 170, 239, 353, 396; acquire Wycliffe, 258; and Smith, 344; nuns, 351, 393
- Tunstall, Cuthbert (1474-1559), Bishop of Durham, 43, 44, 81, 82; and Oath of Supremacy, 77
- Tunstall, Francis, J.P., 170, 309, 326, 331, 335
- Tunstall, Marmaduke (1), 258-9, 292, 297; (2), 381, 398
- Tunstall, Mr, 329
- Tunstall, Mrs Mary, 388
- Tunstall, Robert, rebel, 83
- Tunstall, William, (1), S.J., 237; (2), and the '15, 404 n. 1
- Tyrrell, Anthony, priest, 151, 159
- Ugglebarnby, 182, 270
- Ugthorpe, 25, 38, 149, 165, 370, 375, 378, 402; manor house, 163; vagrant gentry, 181; Radcliffes and, 130, 160, 174, 179, 180, 184, 255, 269, 356; missionary district, 382; mission school, 385, Mass-house, 391
- Ugthorpe-Egton mission, 346, 347-8, 385
- Ullathorne family, 402
- Ullathorne, William Bernard (1806-89), 9, 403
- Ulshaw Bridge, 387; Mass-house, 390
- Ulvason (or Ustanson), William, papist runagate, 27, 42
- Universities, combed for recusants, 98; Catholic tutors, 106, 135; and Oath of Supremacy, 134-5; Catholic entries, 135; Protestantisation, 135; use of by Catholic families, 294
- Upleatham, incidence of recusancy, 425
- Upper Helmsley, 84, 87, 278; incidence of recusancy, 103, 413
- Upsall, 83, 141, 237, 238, 277, 292, 293
- Upsall Castle, priests' resting place, 161, 168; Jesuit 'residence', 238, 247
- Ustanson (or Ulvason) William, deprived priest, 27, 42
- Uvedale, Avery, Protestant J.P., 76
- Uvedale, John, Protestant, 76
- Valladolid, English College, 152, 153, 154, 166, 184, 239; Benedictines of, 232-3, 234, 235, 239-40, 241, 242
- Vaughan, Sir Richard, J.P., 203
- Vaux, William, rebel, 83
- Vavasour, Mr, 329
- Vavasour, Peter, solicitor, 69
- Vavasour, Richard, 103
- Vavasour, Dr Thomas, of York, 60, 186
- Veracini, Francis, 395
- Vernon, Mr Justice, 231
- Vicar family, 102
- Villiers, *see* Buckingham
- Wait Mrs, prisoner in York Castle, 330
- Waite family, 175, 263, 354, 359, 390
- Waite, George, 304
- Waite, Helen, nun, 351-2

- Waite, James, S.J., 239
 Walker, William, 'old priest', 45
 Wallock, William, runaway papist, 29, 42
 Walmesley family, 320
 Walmesley, Gilbert, 395
 Walmesley, Lady, Juliana, 347
 Walmesley, Richard, 334
 Walsingham, Sir Francis (?1530-90), 98;
 and Catholic depression, 112, 159
 Walton, 72, 73, 189, 374; Fairfax dower
 house, 347
 Walworth family, 357, 359
 Wandesford family, 91-2, 101, 163, 170,
 201, 208, 259, 266
 Wandesford, Christopher, 225, 228, 229;
 and wardship of Elizabeth Savage, 258
 Wandesford, Sir Christopher, 117
 Wandesford, Michael, and Oath of Supre-
 macy, 77, 78, 79
 Warcop, Henry, s. of Thomas, 266
 Warcop, Mrs, wife of Thomas, 163
 Warcop, Thomas, lay missionary, 61, 174;
 and Thornton Woods, 164-5, 253;
 martyrdom, 163; and allegiance, 167
 Ward family, 206
 Ward, Barbara, recusant wife of Robert,
 172
 Ward, John, convert and author, 348
 Ward, Marmaduke, father of Mary, 186
 Ward, Mary, (1585-1645), 186, 279, 296;
 her daughters of St. Agnes, 254, 268,
 306, 322, 347, 351; career, 254-5,
 293; Institution, 255; and Mount
 Grace, 276; *Life of*, 276
 Ward, Robert, 172
 Wardal, Richard, master mariner, 402
 Wards, Court of, a threat to the gentry, 71;
 Meynell and, 126; Danby and, 127-8;
 and recusancy, 224; and enforcement
 of Protestantism, 224-5, 303
 Warren, John, Prebendary of York, 25
 Wastell family, 305
 Wastell, Matthew, 305
 Waters, Abbé (*alias* Duvivier), 368
 Wath, 27, 72, 78; Mellerby grange, 74;
 incidence of recusancy, 265, 434
 Watkinson, Robert, S.J., 173
 Watson family, 190, 283
 Watson, Sir Christopher, vicar, 52
 Wattes, William (or John), seminary priest,
 58
 Webb, Sir William, equerry, 280
 Welburn, 45, 76, 203; Hall, 190
 Welbury, 52, 63; incidence of recusancy,
 185, 194, 274, 417
 Well, 40, 51, 63, 294; and the Rising, 68;
 incidence of recusancy, 91, 432
 Welton, Colonel, 307
 Wensley, 28, 51, 81, 82, 402; Catholic
 congregations, 257, 393; incidence of
 recusancy, 430
 Wensleydale, 29, 346
 Wentworth, Michael, 223
 Wesley, John (1703-91), at Osmotherley,
 387
 West Harsley, 63
 West Hauxwell, 203
 West Langbaurch, 102, 179; incidence of
 recusancy, 423-5
 West Layton, 83, 171, 259
 West Rounton, 32
 West Tanfield, incidence of recusancy, 434
 West Witton, 402; incidence of recusancy,
 430
 Westbrook, Fr. Maurus, chaplain, 386
 Westerdale, 240, 300; Yowards of, 81, 99,
 179, 180, 228, 246, 268, 285
 Westminster Committee for Sequestrations,
 303; and Meynell estate, 315
 Westmorland, Charles Neville, 6th Earl of
 (1543-1601), 12, 14, 72, 296;
 landownings, 64; attainted, 64; under
 suspicion, 65; his religion, 66-7;
 retinue, 68; and the Rising, 82; fate
 of his estates, 86
 Westmorland, Henry Neville, 5th Earl of
 (? 1525-63), 67, 108 n. 29
 Wetherby, 125, 211, 302
 Whalley family, 187, 279
 Whalley, Alice, 101
 Whalley, Thomas, 99
 Wharton, Thomas Wharton, 2nd Baron
 (1520-72), 63-4; under suspicion,
 65; his religion, 67
 Wharton, Michael, 308
 Wharton, Sir Michael, sheriff, 210
 Whenby, 37, 99, 246, 309, 345, 349, 359;
 incidence of recusancy, 103, 187, 278,
 357, 414; manor house chapel, 390
 Whippe, recusant, 95
 Whitby, 80, 144, 149, 180, 276, 302, 378,
 402; a mesne borough, 18; survival of
 Catholic customs, 23-4, 80; Cholm-
 leys and, 71-2, 81, 96, 120, 160,
 181-3; priests' resting-place, 161-2;
 Jesuits, 239, 247; incidence of recu-
 sancy, 270, 426; missionary centre,
 382-3; Mass-houses, 392; Catholic
 congregations, 394
 Whitby Strand, 72, 74, 99, 356; Cholmleys
 and, 72, 81, 120, 270; incidence of
 recusancy, 102, 179, 180, 181, 215,
 270, 426-7; Catholic congregations,
 169, 257, 267
 White, George, (1) clerical schoolmaster,
 27, 42, 109 n. 35; (2), actor, 290
 White, Thomas (1), 'old priest', 45; (2)
 (*alias* Blackloe), 341

- Whitgift, John (?1530-1604), Archbishop of Canterbury, and religious persecution, 114
- Whittingham, Sir Timothy, J.P., 119, 202
- Whittingham, William (?1524-79), Dean of Durham, Marian exile, 33; and 'old priests', 34
- Whiton, 373
- Whixley, 182, 221, 333
- Whorlton, 21, 51; Catholic congregations, 394; incidence of recusancy, 422
- Widdrington family, 335, 367
- Widdrington, Lord and Lady, 330, 334, 368
- Wigganthurpe, 187, 357; Methams and, 237, 288, 293, 307, 313; sale of, 341, 357
- Wigginton, 414
- Wilde family, 316, 355
- Wilde, John, 315
- Wildon Grange, 83, 85, 87, 101
- Wildon family, 180, 187, 188, 268, 279, 283
- Wildon, John, 290
- Wildon, Katherine, 103
- Wildon, Thomas, 103, 180
- Wiles family, 272
- Wilkinson, Oswald, Keeper of York Castle, 132
- Wilkinson, Thomas, vicar, 32
- Wilkinson, William ('Little Sir William'), 45
- Willauce, Richard, and recusant wife Elizabeth, 172
- Williamson, Sir Richard, 212
- Williamson, Robert, deprived priest, 42
- Williamson, Thomas, 136
- Willoughby, Stephen, 284
- Wills, priests, and religious conservatism, 49, 50; expressions of belief, 50-1; changing character, 51; of the laity, 51-2, 67, 80
- Willy, Richard, yeoman, 143
- Wilson family, 275, 276
- Wilson, Francis, surgeon, 402
- Wilson, William, runagate papist, 31
- Wilton, 47, 245, 269, 290
- Winchester, Charles Powlett, 6th Marquess of, 258
- Winspear family, 402
- Winspear, General Antonio, 403
- Winspear, Charles and David, 403
- 'Wisbech Stirs', 163, 167, 168
- Wiseman, lay patron, 167
- Witham family, 260, 313, 354, 396; recusants, 174; women, 174, 351, 393; and liberalism, 382; middle classes, 401
- Witham, Cuthbert, rebel, 83; vagrant recusant, 174
- Witham, Dorothy, Mary and Christine, nuns, 351
- Witham, George, J.P., 321, 335
- Witham, George (1655-1725), Vicar Apostolic, 398
- Witham, John, 308
- Witham, Mr, sheriff's deputy, 126
- Witham, Roger, Benedictine, 241-2
- Witham, Thomas, 328
- Witham, William, 398
- Withes, Margery, breach of promise suit, 288
- Witton, 393
- Wolfe family, 271
- Wolfe, William, S.J., 237, 294
- Women, and the religious life, 253-7, 292-3, 351-2
- Wood, Thomas, schoolteacher, 293
- Woolley, 223
- Worlab, 319
- Worsall, Sayers and, 78, 95, 117, 129, 152, 172, 179, 220, 267, 355; sale of estate, 310
- Worsley family, 211; and Hovingham, 284-5, 358
- Worsley, Elizabeth, 284
- Worsley, Robert, gaoler of New Fleet prison, 132-3, 188, 284
- Worsley, Sir Robert, 188
- Worsley, Thomas (1), 284-5; (2), J.P., 333
- Wray family, 101
- Wray, Sir Christopher (1524-92), Lord Chief Justice, 56-7, 80, 89, 172
- Wray, Thomas, rebel, 83, 89
- Wray, William, and recusant wife Jane, 172
- Wright family, 176, 181, 199, 206
- Wright, Alice, accused of adultery, 186
- Wright, John, conspirator, 186
- Wright, Robert and wife, 103
- Wright, Thomas, S.J., 120; leaves the Society, 167, 251
- Wright, Mrs Ursula, 254
- Wright, William, gent., 104
- Wright, Sir William, 52
- Wycliffe, 31, 45, 214, 294, 342; Tunstalls and, 258-9, 309, 312, 335, 344, 381, 404 n.1; chapel, 389; Catholic congregation, 393; incidence of recusancy, 440; Wycliffe family and, 31, 78, 80, 81, 93-4, 100, 101, 141, 206
- Wycliffe family, 116, 171, 191, 258
- Wycliffe, Francis, vagrant Catholic, 94, 100, 101, 141, 142-5, 171
- Wycliffe, Henry, rebel, 83, 94
- Wycliffe, Joan, 80
- Wycliffe, John (d. 1384), 93
- Wycliffe, William (1), J.P., 78, 80, 81, 93-4, 100, 171; (2), s. of Francis, conspirator, 171, 206

- Wykeham, incidence of recusancy, 105, 272, 418
- Wyvill family, 101, 354, 359; of Masham, 175, 176, 260, 264; of Constable Burton, 175, 246, 262, 305, 320, 354; of Osgodby, 272, 356
- Wyvill, Christopher (1), J.P., 78, 89-90; (2) (1740-1822), and Reform, 380
- Wyvill, Sir Christopher (1614-172), J.P., 175, 320-1, 328, 365; his books, 321, 354
- Wyvill, John, J.P., 322
- Wyvill, Mrs, 255
- Wyvill, Robert, 22
- Wyvill, Roger, J.P., 221, (and son), 171, 272
- Wyvill, William, of Patrick Brompton, 90, 91
- Yafforth, 60, 92, 101, 129, 276, 304
- Yarm, 46, 102, 125, 237, 270, 273, 301, 352, 356, 393; estate owners, 63; and the Rising, 82, 84; Sayers and, 95, 318; Jesuits of, 237, 239, 247; Catholic congregations, 257, 394; sale of, 310; incidence of recusancy, 423
- Yate, Sir John, 359
- York, 30, 37, 38, 41, 85, 402; recusant gentry families, 54-5, 59, 186; Grammar School, 294; Civil War and, 301, 302; nuns, 351
- York Castle, as a prison, 132, 140, 141, 142-3, 163, 171, 231, 330-1, 342, 387; Bell's Mass visitation, 151; charges against Catholic prisoners, 195; N. Riding prisoners, 330-1
- York High Commission, and recusants, 15, 16, 31, 58, 89 ff., 200, 201; and non-subscribing clergy, 28, 30, 31, 36; and Morton, 37; and Pursglove, 38; and the Rising, 47; and liturgical survivals, 53; and reconciliation, 136, effect of prerogative action, 145, 146-7; numbers summoned, 146; and clandestine marriage, 149; and the Calverts, 176-7; and the Cholmleys, 182; and the Readshaws, 186; and Mathew's appointment, 207-8; Thornborough and, 209; Dalton and, 209; licensed agents, 211; increased ingenuity, 215; and Catholic contumacy, 216; work after 1619, 222; and children of recusant parents, 224; Wentworth and, 226; ceases to exist (1641), 233, 322; and Bulmer, 245; foray against superstitions, 1614, 275
- York, Kidcotes, 29, 30, 193
- Yorke family, 205, 206
- Yorke, Christopher, Carthusian, 289
- Yorke, Sir Edward, J.P., 203, 204
- Yorke, Elizabeth, vagrant Catholic, 277, 284
- Yorke, Sir John, J.P., 289, 320
- Yorke, Lady, 225
- Yorkshire, Royal Commission and the new religion, 11; religious tests, 24; clerical population, 33; change in its society, 65 ff.; condition of the gentry, 70-5; and Essex revolt, 121; Catholic executions in, 139 ff.; personal lives of its Catholics, 191-6; and the Gunpowder Plot, 206; Civil War and, 301-2, 303, 306; Royalist v. Cromwellian issues, 341; its Catholic vicariate, 344-51; Catholic distribution by estate value, 366; Reform movement, 276, 380; Catholicism in the 1780s, 395
- Young, apostate priest, 143
- Young, George (1777-1848), *History of Whitby*, 23-4
- Young, John (d. 1672), priest, 341, 343, 345, 349
- Young, Thomas (1507-68), Archbishop of York, 38, 53, 81; and recusants, 11, 14, 16, his visitation, 16, 25; 'old priest', 33; and the laity's religion, 75, 76, 78; list of Richmondshire Justices, 78-9
- Yoward family, 104, 179, 191, 246, 268
- Yoward, Ralph (1), of Stokesley, 81, 99, 102; (2) of Westerdale, 228-9
- Yoward, Robert, 180, 285

165190		282.4274
Aveling, Hugh		Av32
Northern Catholics.		

165190

282.4274

Av32

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary

175 Ninth Avenue
 New York, N. Y. 10011

Please stamp date in left column, write your name legibly in center column and leave right column blank. Deposit circulation card in slot marked 'Circulation cards'.

There is no date due, but books must be returned promptly upon request. Do not lend books charged to you to others. You are responsible for them.





